NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW

NO. DCLXXIX

JUNE, 1912

TWO DEMOCRATIC CANDIDATES

BY THE EDITOR

It is a significant and encouraging fact that two of the leading candidates for the Democratic nomination for President hail from the long-ostracized South—significant because of the total absence of invidious remark in the North and the West, encouraging as evidence of a country at last reunited in truth as well as in name. One is Speaker of the House of Representatives; the other is its leader. They personify, respectively, the old and the new schools of American statesmanship. Despite their long experience in the public service, they are necessarily less well known through the medium of their utterances than corresponding leaders of the party which has held direct authority and responsibility for so many years. Now, however, in view of the existing political condition, attention is riveted upon them. The sole purpose of the following presentation is to enable readers of the Review to make acquaintance, not with their personalities, but with their minds.

CHAMP CLARK

Champ Clark was born in Anderson County, Kentucky, on March 7, 1850. The community was one of pioneers whose days were long and full of toil. From dawn to dusk

Copyright, 1912, by The North American Review Publishing Company. All Rights Reserved.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

man labored in forest and field and woman's work was never done. For boys and girls was little play. It was a struggle for existence in which all joined with the resolution and cheery optimism of a hardy race. From early necessities and fatiguing experience Champ Clark derived the intense sympathy with tillers of the soil, which continues to be the distinguishing trait of his guileless nature. From his father he inherited love for imaginative literature and picturesque expression; from his mother consciousness of reverence and faith in the justice and mercy of God. Isolated from humankind, he could live and die content if not deprived of the exaltation which such a spirit is able invariably to draw from the poetry of the Bible.

Champ Clark's early life was so typical of American development that it need not be depicted. Craving for knowledge dominated. Hence earnest application, first in the common schools, then in country college and State university, finally as teacher himself and president of a small college in West Virginia at twenty-three. Admitted to the bar at twenty-five in Bowling Green, Missouri, he became city attorney in 1878, began his political career as member of the State Assembly in 1889, was elected to Congress in 1893, achieved influence slowly but steadily until he was chosen to be, first, leader of the minority and, secondly, Speaker of the House by the unanimous voice of his party associates. It is with the development of his intellect and judgment, as indicated by his public utterances during the past twenty years, that we shall concern ourselves upon the eve of the Democratic National Convention, to which his name will be presented as that of one worthy to become a candidate for President of the United States.

Grover Cleveland was inaugurated the second time on March 4, 1893. On the same day Champ Clark began his long period of service as Representative in Congress. The Democratic party had carried the country upon two vital declarations:

"Republican protection is a fraud, a robbery of the great majority of the American people for the benefit of the few."

"We hold to the use of both gold and silver as the standard money of the country, and to the coinage of both gold and silver without discrimination against either metal."

Champ Clark was a zealot. His belief in the rightfulness of these two proposals was as strong as his faith in

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the righteousness of his Maker. His first speech on the double standard, delivered on August 19, 1893, began as follows:

"MR. SPEAKER. To demonetize or not to demonetize silver is the question that now confronts us. We might as well recognize the truth and look it squarely in the face. There is no good to come of beating about the bush. There is no sense in whipping the devil around the stump.

"No subterfuge, no sophistry can delude the people on this momentous subject. The issue is squarely joined. There is, there can be, no misunderstanding about it. From utterances, public and private, here, from articles in current magazines and periodicals, we know that it is the remorseless purpose of a minority of this House to utterly destroy silver as a money metal, while a majority of us are determined to restore it to its place of ancient honor, usefulness, and beneficence in the coinage of the country. [Applause.]

"There can be no straddling, no dodging, no foraging between the lines, and no fence-riding in this fierce contest.

"He who is not with us is against us." [Applause.]

He set forth the familiar arguments in favcr of bimetallism and continued:

"MR. SPEAKER. It is an old saying that all things are fair in love or war, and some people appear to believe that anything is fair in politics. I dissent *in toto* from any such immoral doctrine. The people have a right to honest treatment at the hands of those who aspire to be their agents in public affairs, and to the man who betrays them they will send the silken bowstring for his own destruction. [Loud applause.] It is my solemn conviction that the man who will deceive the people to obtain an office will desert them when in office.

"I reiterate the proposition—and it cannot be repeated too often—that the Chicago platform proclaimed to all the world that we are in favor of cutting the tariff to a strictly revenue basis, and in favor of bimetallism; and let me tell the single-gold-standard Democrats that if the people west of the Alleghanies had not believed that both of those things would come about there would now be no Democratic Congress to pass a money bill and no Democratic President to sign one. [Loud applause.] The people knew what they wanted, and they thought they knew what they were getting. [Laughter and applause.] Shall they have it, or shall they not?

"Will we redeem the solemn pledges made by tongue and pen to the people and be considered their benefactors forever, or will we violate our vows and have pronounced upon our heads their anathema maranatha? Will we restore happiness and prosperity to the land and read our history in the nation's eyes, or will we be the instruments in creating universal bankruptcy among the people who have committed to our hands a sacred trust?

"These questions I press home upon the mind, heart, and conscience of every Democrat upon this floor. . . .

"Now, the average American citizen may not be much of a political

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

economist or logician. He may not know a syllogism when he sees it, and cannot in technical terms distinguish a major premise from a minor; but nevertheless, in his own homely way, he reasons a great deal more than he gets credit for. He knows when he is hurt and when his business is crippled. [Applause.] He understands that when, after toiling sixteen hours a day through summer's heat and winter's cold, and after practising the severest economy, he cannot at the end of the year make buckle and tongue meet, there is something radically wrong and that 'something is rotten in the state of Denmark.' . . .

"The leaders in the cities express their opinions through the metropolitan press by resolutions of all sorts of boards and by pamphlets galore. The great body of the people, the wealth-creators, are not heard from in any such way; but as certain as God reigns in heaven they will discover a way to make their voice penetrate even to this Hall.

"'Let the people eat grass!' quoth the pampered lackey of Louis XVI., who lost his head upon the block.

"'The people be damned!' shouts William H. Vanderbilt, whose father laid the foundations of a more than princely fortune by selling root-beer at three cents per glass.

"'Popular delusions!' exclaims the gentleman from Tennessee, whose sudden conversion eclipses that of Saul of Tarsus, as he journeyed down from Jerusalem to Damascus. [Laughter and applause.]

"Over against these ejaculations I would place for our instruction the words of the foremost man of all this world. On a celebrated occasion Queen Victoria thought to overawe William E. Gladstone by saying, 'Do you know who I am? I am the Queen of England!' To which the great Commoner answered, 'Madam, do you know who I am? I am the people of England!' [Applause.]

"No wonder he is universally known as the Grand Old Man."

He concluded sonorously:

"The great Irish orator, Charles Stewart Parnell, once said:

"'Opportunity is a horse, saddled and bridled, which stops at each man's threshold once in a lifetime. Be ready, mount, and he carries you on to success and honor. Pause but a moment, he is gone, and the clatter of his iron hoofs, echoing down the corridors of time, will forever remind you of what you have lost.'

"My Democratic brethren, the magnificent silver-white steed stands pawing impatiently at our gates. Let us vault into the saddle and ride him into the realm of unfailing prosperity, amid the benedictions of a grateful people."

Here spoke the orator of the plains, voicing the prejudice of country against city with extravagant expression and sophomoric peroration, but through the grandiloquent language rang the note of intense earnestness and uncompromising defiance in support of what the speaker believed to be the rights of the people.

With like vigor and in similar vein he made his first

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

speech on the tariff on January 15, 1894, extracts from which follow:

"I am in favor of the Wilson bill because it will render our laborers independent freemen and eager patrons of our merchants and our farmers, which God intended them to be, and not the ragged habitués of soup-houses, to which pitiable condition a protective tariff has reduced them.

"Tennyson says:

"'Better fifty years of Europe
Than a cycle of Cathay':

"And I say: Better for the American workman is steady employment at fair wages than all the charity which Andrew Carnegie could dispense from his Scottish castle in a thousand years. [Applause.]

"If the Wilson bill conferred no other boon upon the people of America than placing salt on the free list, that alone would be its ample vindication.

"God made salt an absolute necessity to animal life; consequently it is abundant in quantity and universal in diffusion. It is everywhere—held in solution in the ocean, lakes, and springs. It is mingled in every soil under heaven. It is found in solid and inexhaustible masses in Kansas, Nevada, and many other States and countries. It is scooped up by the ton on the seashore and on the banks of the Great Salt Lake of Utah—already prepared for the use of man and beast. It is pumped from the recesses of the earth and evaporated by the sun. It is quarried in great blocks like building-stone. God made it cheap and bountiful; the tariff barons make it scarce and dear. From time immemorial it has been the test of friendship and the pledge of hospitality. To taste an Arab's salt is to secure his protection forever. Among the ancients it was part of their sacrificial ceremonies. The New Testament Scriptures abound in allusions to it. Its importance has been recognized in all the literatures of the world. The Saviour of mankind gave it the seal of His divine approbation when He said to His disciples: 'Ye are the salt of the earth.'

"It should be as free as the air we breathe, but the greed of man has laid a heavy tax upon this purifier and preserver of things physical. This disgrace upon our civilization should be wiped from our statute-books instanter and without ceremony. It is not only a grave mistake from an economic standpoint, but is essentially wicked. Even a heathen emperor—Aurelian, one of the greatest of the Roman conquerors, glory to his name!—hundreds of years before Christopher Columbus set sail from Palos, had a nobler conception of humanity, and prohibited his soldiers from levying a tribute of salt upon any subjugated people.

"The pathway of civilization on this continent may be traced by the salt springs. Round about them clustered the earliest settlements in the wilderness. They constituted the mile-posts on the march of the all-conquering Caucasian from the Atlantic to the Pacific.

"The history of the Blue Licks and of Boone's Lick forms as romantic chapters as can be found in martial story. It was free salt which lured Daniel Boone and his comrades to those spots far beyond the outposts of civilization.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"Thomas H. Benton labored for a quarter of a century to place salt upon the free list, and when he had succeeded, in his exaltation of spirit he declared that he could hear the cattle on a thousand hills bellowing out their love and gratitude to him. [Laughter and applause.]

"Pass this bill and give the people a chance to earn an honest living. An idle brain is the devil's workshop.

"The ideal condition of affairs is not where there are a few very rich men and a great many very poor men, but where everybody can find work to do. [Applause.]

"Men with brains in their heads, the love of humanity in their souls, and the courage of their convictions in their hearts, will with eager hands rend the temple of protection till not one stone shall be left upon another in that robbers' castle. God speed the day!" [Applause.]

The Wilson bill was emasculated by the Senate, and in 1896 Bryan was defeated on the silver issue. He and his supporters insisted and believed that the election of McKinley was directly attributable to the use of an enormous corruption fund raised in the East by Mr. Hanna. The Far West and the Southwest were angry to the verge almost of insurrection. Cleveland was held responsible for what they considered a gross violation of their rights as citizens. Champ Clark returned to Washington in March, 1897, imbued with their wrath. The Dingley bill was brought forward for immediate consideration. On March 26th, while stinging with resentment, he engaged in a running debate, in the course of which, egged on by mischievous Republicans, he declared:

"Grover Cleveland is not a Democrat. [Laughter on the Republican side and applause on the Democratic side.] As a Democrat, bred and born, understanding its tenets, loving its traditions, ready always and everywhere to battle for its principles, I solemnly declare that he never was a Democrat.

"On the 4th of March, 1893, sustained by a people's love, he might have stood against the world; now, none so poor as to do him reverence.

"On the 6th of March, 1893, in his first official act, he startled all the Democrats in the land, and a great many Republicans, by appointing to the highest office within his gift a sore-head Republican. [Laughter.]

"According to his mugwumpish notions, he could not find within the confines of the Republic a Democrat fit to be Secretary of State.

"That was the beginning of the end, and from that day to this he has been the best friend the Republican party ever had—its most efficient ally. We repudiate him and all his works."

Five days later he added, bitterly:

"Mr. Chairman, after nine days of sore travail, at last one truth has been brought forth on the Republican side of this House, and that by

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. Linney], when he said that I would destroy every custom-house in America. He is entirely correct. If I had my way to-day, sir, I would tear them all down, from turret to foundation-stone, for from the beginning they have been nothing but dens of robbers."

The passage of the bill under the whip and spur of Speaker Reed served only to enhance the rancor of the Western farmers at what they regarded as Cleveland's betrayal of both cause and pledge. On May 3, 1898, his throat choking with rage, Champ Clark spoke as follows:

"There are but two men in all the hoary registers of time that Cleveland's name ought to be associated with—Judas Iscariot and Benedict Arnold. Shades of Arnold, forgive the profanation!

"He at least did not hire a substitute to do his fighting. The blood which he shed at the storming of Quebec and on the heights of Saratoga was American blood. The shattered leg which was buried in his grave of obloquy was an American leg, broken by British bullets in the holy cause of liberty.

"Arnold was at one time both a hero and a patriot. He fell headlong from his high estate to everlasting infamy.

"Upon reflection, I think really I ought to beg the pardon of Judas Iscariot, because after his treason he did have the grace to go out and hang himself. [Laughter.] The Missourians did vote for Grover Cleveland in Chicago."

Mr. Cummings. "Was he not a Democrat then?"

Mr. Clark, of Missouri. "No. We thought he was; but we were sadly mistaken. He stole the livery of Heaven to serve the devil in. He played a colossal bunco game on the Democratic party. He was the tool of the plutocrats masquerading as a Democrat."

Mr. Mitchell. "Why did you vote for him, then?"

Mr. Clark, of Missouri. "I will tell you why we nominated him. We nominated him because he sent that free-trade message to Congress in 1887. We thought that Cleveland was honestly a free-trader."

"Now, Mr. Speaker, we voted for Cleveland on that ground. I am afraid we shall never get forgiveness for it. His conduct on the financial question is not the main charge that I bring against Cleveland, bad and un-Democratic as it was. We took him, knowing that he differed with us somewhat on the silver question, but we believed that as an honest man—because then we believed he was honest—if he accepted the nomination on that platform, knowing the overwhelming sentiment in the Democratic party in favor of silver, he would subordinate his private opinion to the general Democratic opinion and carry out what we wanted.

"That's what he should have done. Otherwise he ought to have declined the nomination. Men are not forced to be President. They are not compelled to hold office. At least I have not found it so in Missouri. But the main charge that I bring against him—and I have always been a free-trader—is this, that he not only undid us on the money question and used the patronage of his great office ruthlessly and corruptly to get the Sherman law repealed, because when we first met here in con-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ference we had a majority of this House against that repeal, but when we came to vote on it we could only muster a paltry 101 votes—the worst charge that will be laid at his door in the day of judgment is that he betrayed a great party on the tariff question.

"Yes. Grover Cleveland by his unfaithfulness did the cause of free trade more harm than all the McKinleys and Dingleys could do in one hundred years. He could not kill it. Nobody can do that; but he did set it back for perhaps a generation.

"The tariff barons ought to build a monument to his odoriferous memory.

"I believe now, and I shall always believe, that on the day when he stood in the sleet and snow and rain, the day when he was sworn in for his second term, he held it in his pudgy fist to keep the Democratic party in power in this country for a quarter of a century, and all that he had to do to work that beneficent result was to do what he had solemnly promised to do by word of mouth, by speech, in writing, in every way in which a man can be committed to do a thing—and that was to cut the robber tariff to a purely revenue basis. That was the issue on which we won the sweeping victory of 1892—a victory the fruits of which turned to apples of Sodom on our lips, through the action as well as the non-action of Grover Cleveland. It is sickening and pitiful to think of what is and then of what might have been had we elected a real Democrat in 1892."

Violent words, these; to many, doubtless inexcusable if not indeed unpardonable. That they were the accurate expression of the speaker's community, however, may not be questioned. That the provocation which evoked their utterance was not small is equally manifest. That they constituted an outburst of honest indignation, whether righteous or not, none will deny. Would Champ Clark recall or conceal the words if it lay within his power to do so? We think not. He might and doubtless does regret both the occasion and the vituperation, but no consideration of expediency could impel contrition for having spoken at a given time, under given conditions, what he then believed to be the truth. Susceptible of explanation or not, the record stands, and he would be the last to blot it out for personal advantage.

Six years passed. Champ Clark was now fifty-four years old. Had experience brought knowledge, wisdom, consideration, recognition of things existing no less than of things desired? We turn to the tariff, or reciprocity, debate of 1904:

MR. OLMSTED. "Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman from Missouri whether he entertains the same views and stands in the same position to-day as regards the tariff that he did in 1897, when the Dingley bill was on its passage?"

MR. CLARK. "Academically, yes. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Just exactly. Now, sit down till I answer you. [Laughter.] Academically, yes."

MR. DALZELL. "Will the gentleman allow me for a moment?"

MR. CLARK. "Wait until I get through with the other Pennsylvanian. I heard the Hon. Thomas B. Reed state, on the floor of this House, that free trade is a beautiful theory; that it might do for England, but that we had not yet reached that state. Practically, as legislating for the country, with certain laws on the statute-books and certain habits formed, I would not go to a free-trade basis, and before I get through, if I have the time, I will state the Democratic position exactly about cutting down the tariff rates.

MR. DALZELL. "Will the gentleman allow me now?"

MR. CLARK. "Yes."

MR. DALZELL. "I want to know whether the gentleman on March 31, 1897, said on the floor of this House the following:

"'I repeat, so that all men may hear, that I am a free-trader, and proudly take my stand with Sir Robert Peel, Richard Cobden, John Bright, and Henry George. I may be an humble member of that illustrious company, but it is better to be a doorkeeper in the house of honest free-traders than to dwell in the tents of wicked protectionists.'"

MR. CLARK. "Yes."

MR. DALZELL. "That is an accurate quotation?"

MR. CLARK. "I think it is. It sounds like I would have put it." [Laughter.]

MR. DALZELL. "Does the gentleman still keep the same position?"

MR. CLARK. "Theoretically, yes." [Laughter on the Republican side.]

"I will tell you my position about it exactly. If a new continent should be discovered, and I should be given charge of its government after it was populated, I should establish free trade."

MR. LACEY. "And not otherwise?"

MR. CLARK. "Not otherwise? There is no sense in adding those words to it. I have stated the case." [Laughter.]

MR. MCCLEARY, of Minnesota. "Will not the gentleman be good enough to define 'free trade' as he uses that expression now?"

MR. CLARK. "Free interchange of the products of the world."

MR. MCCLEARY, of Minnesota. "Without a tariff on any import?"

MR. CLARK. "In order to raise money to run the Government I would levy a revenue tariff. We are in a situation produced by the practice and theory of over a hundred years. The American people have fallen into the habit of raising a large part of the revenue by tariff taxes, and they seem to think it is easier to do it in that way than in any other. Therefore I would not go to the basis of free trade. I would cut down the exorbitant and outrageous exactions of the Dingley bill."

MR. DALZELL. "But, if the gentleman will allow me, we are in precisely the same condition to-day that we were when he made that declaration, so far as revenue is concerned."

MR. CLARK. "Oh, no, we are not."

MR. DALZELL. "Precisely."

MR. CLARK. "I made that declaration in 1897, and the Treasury was empty. Now the Treasury is overflowing, and if they will pare down

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the appropriation bills in this House as they ought to be pared down we could cut off two hundred millions of revenue and never miss it."

MR. WATSON rose.

MR. CLARK. "Wait until I finish with the gentleman from Pittsburg. Because we are in the habit of raising revenue by tariff taxes under both Republican and Democratic administrations, and because the constitutional provision for levying a direct tax is unfair, inasmuch as it makes it in proportion to the number of people in a State instead of in proportion to the property thereof, and inasmuch as the Supreme Court knocked the income tax in the head, to tell you the truth about it, I do not see any other way to raise a sufficient amount of revenue to run the Government except by tariff taxes and the internal-revenue system. That is the whole of it. . . . But in levying a tariff we want reasonable rates, not excessive rates."

Addressing the House for the first time as Speaker on April 4, 1911, Mr. Clark called for:

"1. An honest, intelligent revision of the tariff downward, in order to give every American citizen an equal chance in the race of life, and to pamper none by special favor or special privilege; to reduce the cost of living by eradicating the enormities and cruelties of the present tariff bill, and to raise the necessary revenue to support the Government."

The various bills passed by the House and now pending in the Senate were constructed upon this theory. To what extent Mr. Clark's present attitude is inconsistent with that taken by him fifteen years ago, and to what extent his vision has been broadened naturally by the assumption of actual responsibility, the reader must determine.

Champ Clark declared his position regarding expansion in a debate upon the Cuban reciprocity bill in 1903, when he said:

"I am in favor of this bill because there are two pieces of ground on the North American continent that I want to see annexed to the United States. One is Cuba, and the other is every foot of the British North American possessions, no matter how far north they extend. [Applause.]

"I am not in favor of conquering them. There is no reason why they should be conquered, and if we act with any sense they will come to us peaceably, and this bill is a step in the right direction. If we want the friendship of Cuba, as we are in duty bound to do, and in good sense bound to do, she will come to us in time without the expenditure of a dollar, without the shedding of a single tear."

During the recent Canadian campaign he repeated this declaration, and the anti-Laurier party and the English Tories distorted it into a threat of enforced annexation, to serve their political purposes. The interpretation was

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

so manifestly unwarranted that the subject is unworthy of consideration.

We have now set forth Speaker Clark's utterances upon important topics which have induced discussion and evoked criticism. As illustrating further the processes of his mind during the past twenty years, no less than as indicating his attitude upon a variety of public questions, we append excerpts from the great number of speeches which he has delivered in the House of Representatives:

"1893.—For political reasons Republicans are very particular to speak of the negro; from force of habit we call him plain 'nigger.' They feed him taffy; we give him the creature comforts of this life. They build for him magnificent 'castles in Spain,' which he can never inhabit; we erect for him unpretentious cabins and bid him be happy with his wife and pickaninnies. [Laughter.] They stuff his head with esthetic philosophy; we furnish school-houses for his children and employ teachers for their education. They give him allopathic doses of sympathy in magazines, newspapers, and public speeches; we minister to his wants in sickness, in distress, and in every time of trouble. They urge him to break into the best society of the South, which he can never do; we give him employment whereby to earn an honest living."

"1893.—I think that the body of men who made the Constitution of the United States formed the most august assembly that ever met beneath the sun. They possessed more wisdom than any other one set of gentlemen that ever undertook to do any one thing. They knew a great deal, but they did not know it all. [Laughter.] They were originators. Of necessity, they were experimenting. They were pioneers in the work of making a paper Constitution. They had no models. They wrought wondrous well. We are largely their debtors. We should never cease to revere their memory. But time is the test of all things, and a century's experience has taught us some things which they did not, which they could not know. Some few, remarkably few, defects have been found in their great work. If they were alive to-day they would be the first to suggest remedies for these defects which no human wisdom could foresee."

"1893.—In the heat of debate we are all liable to make a good many violent statements. I believe this is true about Republicans, and Democrats too—individually, they want to do what is right; that is, the bulk of them. Take the Republicans one at a time, and they are very clever sort of gentlemen [laughter], but take them *en masse,* and they will not do to tie to, by a jugful. [Laughter.] I want to say another thing: We honestly believe, gentlemen, that these laws are dangerous, even to say nothing about their constitutionality. A thing is not good simply because it is constitutional; a great many things might be constitutional and at the same time unnecessary or even dangerous; but I believe they are unconstitutional."

"1894.—I have no prejudice against the people of the District of Columbia. It is a good district and a fine town [laughter], but I hope there will never be such another on the face of the green earth. [Great

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

laughter and applause.] The fact that no man in the District of Columbia is permitted to vote on any proposition whatever is the saddest commentary that has ever been written or uttered upon the principle of free government."

"1898.—Congress should formulate the Monroe Doctrine as we now understand it, and it should be in words about as follows: 'The American Republic hereby takes all of North America, Central America, South America, and all the islands of the adjacent seas under the shadow of her protecting wing, guarantees to them any form of government they choose, and warns Europe, Asia, and Africa to keep their hands off the Western Hemisphere on the penalty of being thrashed within an inch of their lives.' [Applause.]

"That is the Monroe Doctrine as interpreted by a Missouri Democrat. [Laughter.] We should extend a moral protectorate over them all. Not one of these Central or South American Republics can maintain its independence without our support. They caught the spirit of freedom from us. They copied their form of government from ours. Round about the young and feeble Republics already established in this hemisphere we should throw our friendship and influence, and we should encourage Cuba and all the rest of the West-Indian Islands to unite themselves into a republic of their own. The habit of representative government is healthy and laudable. It should be fostered by us in every way possible. We should not only lend them our moral support, but should give them physical aid in cases of necessity.

"It is high time that we served plain and emphatic notice on all kings, emperors, princes, and potentates that the navies of transatlantic powers shall not be used as collection bureaus for questionable debts, as was done a year or two ago at Corinto, and as was done a month or so ago at Haiti." [Applause.]

"1898.—A Chinaman never can be fit for American citizenship. His color, his diet, his mental conformation, his habits of thought, his methods of conduct, his style of living, his ideas of government, his theory of the domestic relations, his code of morals, his religion, his passiveness in servitude, his ultraconservatism, his manners, his amusements, the very fashion of his dress, are radically un-American. In all these he is thoroughly incorrigible. His ways are not our ways. He is among us, but not of us. . . ."

"1899.—Hawaii is a blind for our eyes, a snare for our feet, a bait for our cupidity, the will-o'-the-wisp which will lead us into the Slough of Despond, the bewitching, scheming, treacherous Delilah destined to shear our Samson of his leonine locks and to deliver him bound hand and foot into the power of the Philistines.

"Nature has set bounds to this magnificent Republic beyond which she should not go—the Atlantic on the east, the Gulf of Mexico and the Rio Grande on the south, the Pacific on the west, and in the fulness of time, without the expenditure of a dollar or the spilling of one drop of blood or the shedding of a single tear, the frozen ocean on the north."

"1899.—I say this, I am not hidebound about politics. There are great and distinguished Republicans. I have great admiration for Abraham Lincoln. I claim a part of the honor of Grant's fame as an American citizen. Garfield was a wonder of learning and brains. The younger Harrison was far above the average President in character and capacity.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

I admire McKinley in some respects, but I entertain a supreme contempt, although he is in the grave, for Hayes, because he stole the Presidency of the United States, the greatest crime committed in all the flood of time. I do not care if he is dead. Public men live after they are buried. They live in their records. I wish Hayes had been compelled to live forever and had had to bear the scorn of decent men until the end of the world itself."

"1900.—What difference in principle is there between a few hundred thousand white men buying and owning four million negroes and the Government of the United States buying and owning ten million Malays? If the Filipinos are not to be consulted, what becomes of that clause in the Declaration of Independence which informs us that 'all men are created equal,' and that other which revolutionized half the governments on earth by proclaiming that 'all governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed'? Driven from one untenable position, the nimble jingoes immediately assume another. Their last claim is that we should retain the Philippines because the poor, untutored savages are incapable of self-government, and that if left to themselves they would indulge in revolutions and exterminate one another. I humbly submit that it's none of our affair if they do."

"1900.—I am sure that I would not vote to put a tax on knowledge. I sympathize with the poor boy in his aspirations and struggle for information, for I was as poor a boy as ever grew to lusty manhood in the hill country of Kentucky. I am poor yet. My children are poor. I am a lover of books. I cannot remember a day when I was not. I am glad paper-covered books are cheap; also muslin-bound books, cloth-bound books, leather-bound books, morocco-bound books, books in every binding. But, to save me, I do not see any reason why paper-bound books—books, mark you—should go through the mails at one cent per pound, and the same books, printed by the same men, on the same types and presses, should go at eight cents per pound if they happen to be bound in boards, muslin, leather, etc. It seems to me that what is sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander; that if one sort of books is sent through the mails at one cent a pound all sorts should be sent at the same rate. We should go the whole hog or none."

"1902.—It is absolutely true that the President of the United States intrinsically and theoretically is no better than any other good citizen of the Republic. It is not so much the individual we are trying to protect as to protect the Government of the United States and the people of the United States not only against anarchy, but against sorrow and agony of spirit, such as pervaded the entire country when President McKinley was killed. According to my judgment, the most valuable part of this bill is the part of it which authorizes the punishment of the villains who go around over the country making public speeches advising the assassination of people because they hold public office."

"1902.—There would be more wisdom and more justice in establishing a universal old-age pension for every citizen of the Republic than there are in the manner in which we are proceeding to create an old-age pension list from the civil departments of the Government.

"The average citizen who is not in the employment of the Government is just as worthy of an old-age pension as is the Government employee,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

for the latter receives the higher compensation, while the former does more and harder work."

"1902.—I suggest to every man here, it is not a matter of politics, it is a matter of economy, it is a matter of plain common sense; and every dollar that we expend here in excess of what we ought to spend is practically a robbery of the people. I hear statesmen here talking about the money which belongs to the United States Government. It does not own a single dollar of money anywhere on the face of the earth. It is simply a trustee for the people, and a trustee of an express trust."

"1908.—I will give you a sample of what I consider public honor. John Quincy Adams was one of the most disagreeable personages that ever sat in the White House, but he was thoroughly educated. He had an extremely delicate sense of honor, and I give him that credit and glory. When he was elected to the House after he was President he owned some stock in the old United States Bank, and he went immediately after his election and sold that stock, on the ground that there might be legislation involving the property of the United States Bank in Congress, and I commend his example to all of us. [Applause.]

"While I am talking about John Quincy Adams I will tell you another thing that I commend. He is one of three or four United States Senators that ever had conscience enough, when he was instructed by the legislature of his state to vote in a way that he thought was improper, to resign his office and go home. That is to be commended in him, too."

"1908.—The first time that my wife and I ever attended a White House dinner she was assigned to the Peruvian minister to take her out to dinner. She could not talk any Peruvian [laughter] and he could not talk much English, and though she is a very fine talker the conversation lagged somewhat.

"But, sitting on her right was Mr. Secretary of State John Sherman. She had never been introduced to the Secretary, but she recognized him by his pictures. She had frequently told me privately that she intended that if she ever got close enough to him to ask him about the "Crime of '73." [Laughter.] They scraped up an acquaintance, and Secretary Sherman explained to her how the President and his wife were bedeviled with all sorts of people and how unsanitary the conditions of the house were, and that it wore the President and his wife to a frazzle, and endangered their health—even their lives. After drawing as gloomy a picture as he could, he asked her, 'Madam, would you be willing to see your husband live in this house four years with all that trouble and danger and under those conditions?' With that good sense which she exhibited when she picked her husband she said, 'Yes; I think I would.' [Great laughter.] She said she was willing to take the chances of unsanitary conditions and nervous prostration to see her husband in the White House for four years."

"1910.—I would not give a vote under any consideration whatever that I thought would cripple the United States Government in any of its legitimate functions, for this is as much my government as it is your government, except that you happen to have the offices at the present time and we have not, but that is not the question at issue. It is my government. It is my father's government. It is my children's govern-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ment. A man who would not support it in all of its legitimate functions is not fit for the great honor of American citizenship [applause on the Democratic side], and I always add to the old Democratic dictum, economy in the public expense, that labor may be lightly burdened, this, that every function of the Government should be economically but effectively administered, and enough money should be voted for that purpose. But we should remember that we are trustees of a trust fund, and we have no right to squander the public money. We are not fit to be here if we do. I do not advocate things while we are in the minority which I will be unwilling to advocate when we are a majority. We in Congress cannot reasonably expect others to economize unless we set the example.

"Whenever you have a legitimate appropriation here I will vote for it; whenever you have one—I do not care whether it is big or little—which I do not believe should go into an appropriation bill I will vote to put it out; and you can call that poor leadership if you choose, but I believe the American people will indorse it." [Loud applause on the Democratic side.]

"1911.—No man is fit to be the lawgiver for a mighty people who yields to the demands and solicitations of the few who have access to his ear, and is forgetful of the vast multitude who may never hear his voice or look into his face."

"1912.—I repeat that, in my judgment, the tariff and the cognate question of the trusts will constitute the overshadowing issues in the coming campaign. The Republicans will undoubtedly undertake to befog these issues and lure us away from the tariff question and the trust question, because they realize the fact that on the tariff question and the trust question we will defeat them most decisively. Of course, there are subsidiary questions of more or less importance, some of them of great importance, but the battle for tariff reform and the destruction of the trusts must be fought to a finish. On these questions we are undoubtedly in the right. We have justice on our side, and on them we should win a sweeping triumph.

"'By their fruits ye shall know them,' is a rule established by highest authority. It is grounded in wisdom and in justice. By that rule we are ready to be judged.

"In his speech nominating General Grant for a third term Roscoe Conkling said, 'General Grant's fame rests not only on things spoken and things written, but upon the arduous greatness of things done.' That sentence fits the Democrats of Congress like a glove.

"The Republicans seem to be utterly demoralized. That their quarrels, unless composed, will help us there can be no doubt. But our chief reliance for success is to give to the people such a record for honest, intelligent, courageous, constructive, progressive statesmanship as to convince the country beyond the shadow of a doubt that we are worthy of the continued and enlarged confidence of the public. To do this we must lead in the enactment of all remedial legislation. That is our duty to our country and our kind.

"That is the straightest, plainest, shortest, and easiest road to complete success. Pursuing that line of conduct, victory will perch upon our banners whether the Republicans patch up their differences or not. We

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

hold our own fate absolutely in our own hands. Let us not lose our golden opportunity through overconfidence or upon ill-advised reliance upon the quarrels and factional fights among our opponents."

"1912.—Can business men trust the Democratic party? is what the lawyers would call a leading question propounded to me. It is a thing incredible that any sane man or set of sane men would desire to injure any legitimate business. The Democrats constitute one-half of the American people. They are engaged in every species of legitimate business known among men and possible in this country. The effect of law falls like the rain, the sunshine, and the dew of Heaven equally on the just and unjust. Consequently the Democrats cannot injure other people's business without injuring their own. I have said before, and I say now, that no legitimate industry in the United States has any cause whatever to fear the action of the Democrats. The desire of Democrats is to so arrange things, as far as may be, that every American citizen shall have an equal chance in the race of life.

"That is what we promised to do, and that is what we are going to do so far as is possible."

This article is purely expository. It is no part of our purpose to attack, excuse, or defend. Certain deductions, however, may be made. Champ Clark sprang from that hardy stock which produced the American pioneers, virile, intense, honest, patriotic, headstrong. The red blood coursed swiftly through his veins till the mellowing influence of time checked its speed. Responsibility begat reflection and calm, tolerance of the opinions of others, evenness of disposition, moderation in thought, word, and deed. That he achieved his present eminence unaided is no more significant than the use to which he put his power. It is a simple fact, surely worthy of consideration, that never before has the business of the House of Representatives been conducted with more decorum, greater dignity, or truer efficiency than under his guidance as Speaker. That much of his success is attributable to exceptional popularity achieved by a winning personality is plainly evident. But it is no less obvious that underneath are qualities of native ability, of rugged common sense, of undoubted integrity, of intense patriotism, of sympathy with humankind, which constitute character. That his strength should be greater in the West, where he is known, than in the East, where he is comparatively a stranger, is a fact neither discreditable nor uncommon. A like condition existed half a century ago when another son of the plain people, also Kentucky born, was under the scrutiny of those who beheld him from afar. How like the comments of metropolitan

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

journals now are those of the great newspapers then! Turn back the files and read:

From the New York *Herald:*

"*May 19, 1860.*—The Republican Convention at Chicago have nominated Abraham Lincoln, of Illinois, for President of the United States—a third-rate Western lawyer, poorer than even poor Pierce. . . . The conduct of the Republican party in this nomination is a remarkable indication of a small intellect, growing smaller. They pass over Seward, Chase, and Banks, who are statesmen and able men, and they take a fourth-rate lecturer, who cannot speak good grammar, and who, to raise the wind, delivers his hackneyed, illiterate compositions at two hundred dollars apiece. Our readers will recollect that this peripatetic politician visited New York two or three months ago on his financial tour, when, in return for the most unmitigated trash, interlarded with coarse and clumsy jokes, he filled his empty pockets with dollars coined out of Republican fanaticism."

"*May 20th.*—The rejection of Seward and the nomination of Lincoln, who represents all that is brutal and bloody in Seward's political programme, without possessing a tithe of his personal ability, is almost as severe a blow at the Republican party organization as was the feud at Charleston to that of the Democracy. . . . The highest claims for the candidate who is put up as a fit ruler for thirty millions of freemen, pursuing a march of social development with a rapidity that is the wonder of the age, is that he can 'maul rails,' and that he is 'honest.' What part the first of these qualities is to play in the science of government we cannot conceive; the second we know to be the quality that commends him to demagogues and robbers that now swarm about the public offices, for it makes them more secure of their prey."

"*May 21st.*—Lincoln is the echo of Seward without his practical acumen, the follower of Spooner with the rabid spirit of Helper, and the worshipper of John Brown without his pluck. Animated by the same sentiments, but with a far different spirit from that which sent Brown across the Susquehanna, he voluntarily proclaimed in one of his speeches that he 'did mean to go on to the banks of the Ohio and throw missiles into Kentucky to disturb them in their institutions.' Such is the man whom the fanatical black Republicans have brought forward as their choice for President of the American confederation, and for whom they have rejected every man with conservative tendencies, practical statesmanship, or national views, to be found within the party ranks."

"*May 22d.*—The candidate for President, Abram Lincoln, is an uneducated man—a vulgar village politician, without any experience worth mentioning in the practical duties of statesmanship, and only noted for some very unpopular votes which he gave while a member of Congress."

"As to the reception of this miraculous mouse which the Chicago mountain has brought forth, nothing can be more discouraging."

"*May 23d.*—Lincoln is exactly of the same type as the traitor who was hung at Charleston—an abolitionist of the reddest dye, liable to be led to extreme lengths by other men. Without education or refinement, he will be the plaything of his party, whirled along in the vortex of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

passion if he should gain the control of the Government. The comparison between Seward and this illiterate Western boor is odious—it is as Hyperion to a satyr. Lincoln has in an aggravated and virulent degree all that rendered Seward unpopular with the conservative classes, while he has none of those redeeming qualities and gifts of genius which distinguish the son of New York."

From the Albany *Atlas and Argus:*

"*May 21st.*—Mr. Lincoln was first heard of in politics a year ago last fall, when, limping with wounds and howling with anguish, he was driven through the State of Illinois by Douglas, and defeated with the tacit approval of the majority of his own party, and with the publicly expressed gratulations of Greeley, Weed, and others. Last spring he made his début in this State as an orator, and commenced by charging for his speeches at the rate of one hundred dollars apiece, and was forced to desist amid such public expressions of contempt that he may be said to have been fairly hissed out of the State. He has never held public office of any credit, and is not known except as a slang-whanging stump speaker, of a class with which every party teems, and of which all parties are ashamed."

From the Boston *Post:*

"*May 21st.*—Lincoln has merely talent for demagogue appeal, that was thought to be worth in New England fifty or one hundred dollars a speech, by those who hired him; but some who heard him were surprised that he should be considered anywhere a great man. He can only be the tool of the fanatical host he will lead on. This is the truth of the case, let the blowers of his party swell him as they may into tremendous dimensions. By this means, and by imitating in every locality the trickery and demagogism that won Lincoln his local popularity, and at length the nomination, his partisans may attempt to secure his election. But such is the intelligence of the country that his attempt must fail."

From the Philadelphia *Evening Journal:*

"*May 24th.—Why should Lincoln be President?* There is not in all the history of his life any exhibition of intellectual ability and attainments fitting him for the high and responsible post in the Government for which he has been nominated. When in Congress, from 1847 to 1849, he was not only not distinguished by any display of parliamentary talent, or by any special service, but those who sat in the same Congress find it difficult to remember that any such person as Abraham Lincoln occupied a seat on the floor. His contest in 1858 with Mr. Douglas for the election as United States Senator from Illinois is the beginning of his fame, and while he showed in that controversy the rough strength of a practised stump speaker, and the pluck of a champion who enters the ring with a crowd of sturdy backers, he exceeded even Seward in the extravagance of his views respecting the slavery question, while his coarse language, his illiterate style, and his vulgar and vituperative personalities in debate contrast very strongly with the elegant and classical oratory of the eminent Senator from New York"

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

From the Boston *Courier:*

"*July 17th.—A New Argument for the Rail-splitter.* The most careful readers of the Scriptures have sometimes remarked that no matter how carefully or how frequently they have studied the Bible, they are sure to find something new—that is, new to them, of course, because the thought was there from the beginning, and their minds only became prepared to discover it. The lesson is constantly enforced in this way, that man is very much the same as formerly, and that the same things happen to the race now as in former times. But we were scarcely prepared to find so close a description of the Republican candidate to distinction as we see in Psalm 74, v. 5: 'A man famous, according as he had lifted up axes upon thick trees.'"

The parallel is obvious. Morally, we believe it can be said with truth derived from impartial investigation, Champ Clark is the peer of Abraham Lincoln. Of his relative intellectual qualifications for the greatest political position in the world the reader shall be the judge. Our duty ends in setting forth the bases upon which opinion may be formed.

OSCAR W. UNDERWOOD

Oscar W. Underwood personifies the new, progressive, prosperous, business-like South. Born in Kentucky, in 1862, of well-to-do parents and distinguished lineage, graduated from Rugby School, Kentucky, and the University of Virginia, he began to practise law in Birmingham, Alabama, in 1884 and was first elected to Congress in 1894. His advancement followed as a natural consequence of constant application of his exceptional talents until he achieved the position of definite leadership at the beginning of the present Congress. His record in this highly responsible capacity, with respect to intelligence, tactfulness, and courage manifested or to results accomplished under difficult conditions, has never been surpassed.

Mr. Underwood owes no small part of his prominence as a candidate for the Democratic nomination for President to the dictatorial propensities of William Jennings Bryan. While the tariff bills were under discussion Mr. Bryan publicly attacked the Democratic leader as a betrayer of the principles of his party. On the following day Mr. Underwood made the rejoinder which instantly won for him respect and fame throughout the country. The scene in the House of Representatives was admirably depicted by Mr. Samuel G. Blythe:

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"'The gentleman from Alabama is recognized,' said the Speaker, leaning forward.

"'Mr. Speaker,' began Underwood, calmly, evenly, dispassionately, and coolly—'Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of personal privilege.'

"He asked that the clerk read from the newspaper which he held in his hand. It was a telegraphic despatch from Lincoln, Nebraska, and it began: 'The recent activity of Representative Underwood in defeating the attempt by Champ Clark and others to reduce the steel-and-iron schedule has met with the disapproval of W. J. Bryan.'

"The reading clerk paused here, then began again: 'To-day Bryan authorizes the following statement: "The action of Chairman Underwood in opposing an immediate effort to reduce the iron and steel schedule reveals the real Underwood. Speaker Clark and other tariff-reformers tried to secure the passage of a resolution instructing the Ways and Means Committee to take up other schedules, including the iron and steel schedule; but Underwood and Fitzgerald, of New York, succeeded in defeating the resolution."'

"There was more of the statement, but that is enough to show its general tenor. It charged Underwood with being tainted with protection and having an individual interest in the iron and steel business, and was a very pointed and personal assault. After the clerk had finished reading the statement there was a moment of silence. Underwood stood looking directly at the Speaker, who still half leaned across the big desk up under the flag. Then Underwood began speaking, slowly, dispassionately, evenly, and gravely.

"'The statements contained in that article are absolutely false!' he said. Instantly the entire Democratic side broke into a roar of applause.

"'If the reflections that paper contains rested only on myself I should not take the time of this House to answer them; but the statements contained in that article are a reflection on the only body of Democracy that is in control of this Government, and as the representative leader on the floor of this House, of this majority, I should be untrue to my party if I did not rise here and stamp those utterances with the brand of falsehood!'

"Underwood continued. He asserted he had asked the committee to take up the iron and steel schedule first because he comes from an iron and steel district, and appealed to his Democratic colleagues on the committee to support this statement, which they did. He said the committee had deemed it wiser to take up the woolen and the cotton schedules first because the iron and steel schedules had been cut in the Wilson, the Dingley, and the Payne bills—and wool and cotton had not been revised for many years. Mr. Kitchin, of North Carolina, corroborated what Underwood claimed; and Underwood further proved his case, explaining his connection with the iron and steel business—he is a stockholder in a company that makes pig iron—and having a telegram read from Mr. Bryan, dated April 23d, to Ollie James, in which Mr. Bryan asked James to convey his congratulations to Underwood.

"'Mr. Speaker,' said Underwood, 'Mr. Bryan did not say I was protectionizing the Democratic party when I brought in the free-list bill. Not until I differed with him on the woolen schedule did he have one word of criticism so far as my conduct was concerned. . . . I had to write

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

a woolen schedule that would protect the revenues of this Government, and because I did so and did not obey the command of the gentleman from Nebraska, Mr. Bryan, he is endeavoring to make the country believe I am not an honest Democrat in favor of an honest revenue tariff.'

"There was some more of the speech, but not much. It was delivered earnestly, but without heat and without an attempt at oratorical flourish. There was no frenzy of denial, no protesting of innocence, no beating about the bush. A sane young man made a sane denial—and proved his case. That was all there was to it—except this:

"When Underwood finished that statement and sat down, amid the applause of the House, the State of Alabama had a candidate for the Democratic nomination for President. Underwood didn't know it; nor was it the fact that he had assailed Mr. Bryan that made him a candidate. What gave the State of Alabama a Presidential candidate was this: Here was a man with the highest type of political courage—independence. Here was a man who did not attempt to palter with a situation, and a delicate one politically, but met it calmly and proved his contention. Here was a man who, as floor-leader of the House majority, was endeavoring to do what seemed best for the Democratic party and the country, and not for the benefit of any individual or the theories of any individual; and the country applauded."

Thus was the character of Oscar W. Underwood revealed to his countrymen. He had demonstrated his sagacity and effectiveness; here was a manifestation of sincerity and courage such as is seldom seen in public life. From that moment the leader of the House became and is to-day the distinctive embodiment of the chief issue of the Democratic party in its appeal to the country for restoration of full power. Mr. Underwood has defined that issue in these simple words:

"The true distinction between the two great parties of this country, to my mind, is the difference between a prohibitive tariff bill and a competitive tariff bill. The Republican party favors a tariff that will raise some revenue to support the Government, but at the same time will prohibit as much foreign merchandise as possible from coming into the country to raise revenue at all. Though the Republican party has repeatedly declared it favors a tariff to protect the difference in cost of production at home and abroad, in fact it favors a protection of the manufacturers' profits; and the Republican party has continually fixed the rates levied at the custom-house so greatly in excess of the difference in cost of production at home and abroad that in many cases the rate has become prohibitive, and no importation was allowed to enter at all. The Democratic party has always declared for a tariff for revenue only.

"It is true that any tariff taxes that are levied which allow some imports to enter the country would, in one sense, be a tariff for revenue; but I take it that the clear meaning of the declaration of the party in favor of a tariff for revenue means a competitive tariff—that is, a tariff

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that allows sufficient imports from abroad to bring about fair and honest competition, hereby producing revenue and at the same time preventing the home producer from hiding behind a tariff wall that will enable him to establish monopolies and unduly increase the burdens of taxation resting upon the American people, without their receiving any benefit in return, either in the shape of revenue for the Government or in the development of the great industries of the country.

"It is an axiom which cannot be disputed that the moment any industry is allowed to create a monopoly its development along lines of best endeavor at once ceases. If there was a more general understanding that the tariff is a tax, in which private interests share the proceeds with the Government, there would be a more vigorous questioning of the various duties imposed by Congress than has yet been manifested. Protection is granted for the purpose of enabling new industries to establish themselves and to offset the difference in cost at home and abroad. If an industry cannot be strong and lusty in a reasonable time it shows it is developed by artificial means and is not justified—and the props should be taken away. Statistics conclusively show that most of our industries are able to stand alone. Our natural advantages, improved machinery, efficiency of American labor, and ocean freight rates in many instances overcome the differences in cost of labor at home and abroad.

"I recognize that false standards have been ingrafted on our industrial life, and that we cannot strike them all off in an hour or a day without serious danger. What I contend is that we turn our faces away from them and gradually and carefully adjust our laws to meet new conditions, without serious injury to either labor or capital, in order that we may reduce the cost of living at home and be prepared to dispose of more of our surplus products in the markets of the world, to the end that we may give constant employment to labor and maintain stable prices at home.

"The Democratic party does not intend to abandon the custom-houses, but favors a policy of levying customs duties for revenue purposes only, at rates that will not destroy fair and honest competition in the home market. This position will be accomplished by the reduction of tariff taxes provided for in the laws now on the statute-books, to a point where fair competition will bring about reasonable prices and destroy monopolistic tendencies caused by the high duties now levied at the custom-houses."

In the course of his long experience in Congress, Mr. Underwood has discussed all vital public questions. His position has been invariably that of his party. More need not be said. If Underwood has been in the wrong it follows irresistibly that the fundamental principles of Democracy are unsound. It suffices then, for the present purpose, to set forth the one great issue which is more distinctively his issue than that of any other Democrat. This has been done in his own words spoken with the calmness, moderation, and lucidity which characterize his every utterance. His claim to political preferment rests upon exceptional

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ability, sound judgment, perfect poise, faithful service, and noteworthy achievement.

As between Champ Clark, Speaker, and Oscar W. Underwood, leader of the House, choice must be made by the representatives of their party in convention assembled. Conditions which then will have been created in the turbulent ranks of the opposition will be necessarily a large, if not indeed, a determining factor. Happily the integrity, the patriotism, and the Democracy of both are beyond the possibility of question. No Democrat could find excuse for refusing to vote for either. Whichever may be selected, no heartburn will aggravate the other. We record an episode which, though slight in itself, is indicative of personal traits.

When a certain maker of mischief decided to reverse the action of the Democratic caucus with respect to the woolen schedule he made a personal demand upon Speaker Clark that he lead the revolt. The Speaker courteously declined to interfere. But the disturber was persistent. Returning on the following day, he said in words such as these:

"I can now give you the reason why Underwood's programme must be broken."

The Speaker looked up inquiringly. The visitor continued:

"Do you know whom Underwood is for for President?"

"Why, no," said Mr. Clark, quietly; "I have no idea. We have been so busy trying to adjust differences among the members and to get the House into effective working order that we have discussed nothing else. No, the question of the Presidency has never arisen between us."

"Well, I can tell you," was the sharp and significant rejoinder, "he is for Harmon."

The Speaker looked at his interlocutor meditatively and then spoke with homely simplicity:

"Well, Harmon is a good man."

Then turning and gazing through the window-pane, he added, thoughtfully:

"If he wasn't, Underwood wouldn't be for him."

The conversation ended, but three tributes paid in a single sentence live—one to the distinguished Governor of Ohio, another to the capable leader of the House, and a third, unconscious but unmistakable, to the perfect simplicity, absolute honesty, and true magnanimity of the Speaker himself.

THE EDITOR.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

SAFETY AT SEA

BY GEORGE VON L. MEYER, SECRETARY OF THE NAVY

It is within the power of all countries under whose flag ocean-going steamships sail or into whose ports they come to prescribe such rules and regulations to govern their equipment and navigation as would minimize the danger of such accidents as that which befell the White Star steamer *Titanic,* enlarge the possibilities of obtaining assistance, and render it possible to save the life of every person on board in the event of the sinking of the vessel. The loss of more than sixteen hundred lives in this great sea tragedy is a circumstance of which the mournful truth becomes an overpowering horror by the fact that practically every soul on board could have been saved had there been boats to carry them.

First and foremost, then, laws should be at once enacted prescribing that no passenger-steamer shall carry more persons on board, crew and passengers, than can be accommodated in the boats and on the life-rafts provided in the vessel's equipment.

The Congress of the United States unquestionably has the power to enact such laws as applying to vessels flying the American flag, and the further power to enact laws refusing clearance from any American port to any foreign vessel not complying with such laws. Federal inspection of all vessels would be necessary to see that the laws are enforced.

Every member of the crew and every passenger embarking in an ocean-going vessel should be assigned to a certain boat or raft and should be informed of his assignment; each passage ticket should designate the boat to which the holder is assigned, and there should be, in each stateroom, a diagram of the ship showing the location of the boat, the deck from which loaded, and the route by which it could be reached.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

All boats and rafts should be provided with water, provisions, lanterns, and other needful equipment, and should be inspected by government inspectors before each sailing, as well as by the officers of the ship, to each of whom a boat should be assigned as his proper station and particular care.

Frequent drills of the crew in manning the boats should be made mandatory, these drills to include lowering the boats with loads equal to their passenger capacity a sufficient distance to make certain that the falls and blocks are in good condition.

Each vessel should carry a sufficient number of skilled wireless operators to insure one always being on duty. Messengers or other means of communication between the wireless operator and the officer of the watch should also be provided, so that it would be unnecessary for the operator to leave his station. The important point is that there should not be a moment of the day or night during which a distress call may be sent without its being recognized by all vessels within communicating distance.

The Government should prescribe regulations covering all wireless telegraph activities either by international agreement or by national legislation. On occasions of great disaster, such as the loss of the *Titanic,* the eagerness of irresponsible private operators to secure news interferes very seriously with the proper transmission of important messages and leads to all kinds of misinformation being sent broadcast over the world. This situation is so serious that no time should be lost in correcting it.

More than one source of power for the wireless telegraph should be installed. No apparatus of this kind, the efficiency of which may bear such a vital relation to the safety of the vessel, should be dependent on one source of power if an alternative source can be provided. In a sinking ship steam-driven dynamos stop when the water reaches the fires, but an oil-engine or storage batteries on an upper deck would operate the wireless as long as the operator could remain at the key.

The operating radius of the wireless installations of all large steamships should be increased to five hundred miles, not only for the protection of the vessel in case of disaster, but to warn other vessels of dangers to navigation.

The water-tight subdivision of steamships should be such as to afford every possible and reasonable assurance of their

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

safety in case of collision or grounding. The most effective structural protection against collisions on board ship consists in fitting bulkheads which are simply water-tight partitions to confine the flow of water which as a result of collision finds its way into a ship. Obviously the more numerous the bulkheads and decks, and the smaller the water-tight compartments into which a ship is divided, the greater the protection afforded. A large battle-ship will have three or even four skins on each side—the outer bottom, the inner bottom, and one or two longitudinal bulkheads.

In the mammoth ships recently constructed, too much space has been given to the unnecessary luxuries provided to attract patronage on account of the rivalry of competing lines. The space and weight devoted to swimming-tanks, tennis courts, gymnasiums, extra cafés, etc., would be better utilized in improved construction, additional boats and safety appliances, and in additional water-tight bulkheads.

A town of three thousand inhabitants requires a greater police force to protect the citizens than a village of two hundred, so also a steamer carrying thousands of passengers requires more officers and trained seamen than one formerly carrying only hundreds if equal safety to passengers in an emergency is to be secured. Such vessels should be required to carry for each boat at least one officer or efficient petty officer and six members of the crew skilled as boatmen.

The regulations in the United States Navy cover the following points: the exact location of each boat is known to every man assigned to it, and frequent drills are held in which the boats are manned, equipped, lowered, and sent away from the ship. Every boat is fitted with water, provisions, and equipment for navigating; one officer is placed in charge of each boat and is held responsible for its condition and readiness for service.

The Government owns and operates its own wireless telegraph sets, and on every vessel equipped with one there is an operator on duty and listening for calls during every minute of the day and night.

The water-tight subdivisions of United States naval vessels of recent construction are such that no ordinary accident can seriously endanger them; while at sea all doors and other openings in water-tight bulkheads are kept closed except such as must be open for the service of the ship; all these can be closed in a few seconds when the danger

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

signal is given; many can be closed from the bridge, others are closed by hand by men detailed for the purpose and frequently drilled in doing so.

Search-lights are carried by all men-of-war and are used in times of dangerous navigation.

United States naval vessels go at slow speed or steerage-way in a fog or in dangerous waters, and change course immediately to avoid danger.

After the *Bourgogne* disaster a large money prize was offered by certain people who had lost relatives or friends on board the ill-fated ship for the best device for saving large numbers of men in the event of the sinking of a vessel. The award of this prize was made by a committee during or just after the Paris Exposition in 1900. The device suggested consisted in making the bridge of the vessel in the form of a raft or cigar-shaped vessel which could be easily and surely detached from the ship itself when she sank, and which would support six or seven hundred passengers. A similar and perfectly practicable suggestion of having a detachable and floating deck-house to support several hundred passengers has also been made.

Either one of these two devices, had it been fitted to the *Titanic,* would doubtless have meant saving nearly all the lives of those on board. There is no inherent impossibility in fitting both of them should it be desired, and the provision of one or both would insure against a repetition of such accidents even should the sinking of the vessel be so rapid as to make it impossible to lower and fill all the boats.

After all has been done that can be done by laws and international agreement to reduce the dangers of the sea, human beings will take chances and will gamble with Fate; against the accidents that may result from indulgence of this human propensity, perhaps the surest safeguard is the one that the underwriters may set up by refusing insurance to a vessel not properly built and equipped or recklessly speeded or navigated in dangerous lanes.

GEORGE VON L. MEYER.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE LESSON OF THE "TITANIC"

BY LEWIS NIXON

THE incontrovertible facts which stand out in the greatest sea tragedy the world has ever known are that the vessel was going too fast in a region of known danger and that there were not enough life-boats for all persons on board. Such indictments will not be made again, for stringent legislation will secure immediate remedies.

As a preliminary caution the transatlantic lines are all now advertising that the southern route will be used. To go more to the south for the east-bound vessels necessitates moving the west-bound track even farther south, which simply means a longer voyage, and this wise plan of keeping eastward and westward bound vessels in different tracks, thus greatly minimizing risk of collision on the North Atlantic, needs no argument. But whether great departure from the present routes of travel is brought about or not, we may rest secure in the assurance that when passing through the iceberg region far more care will be exercised than was in the case of the *Titanic,* where no special precautions seem to have been taken even after definite warnings.

It may be that the maritime nations will institute a patrol of vessels which at certain seasons will endeavor to keep track of the flow of bergs and ice-fields and warn vessels entering such fields by wireless. As a natural sequence all vessels carrying passengers will be required to install wireless equipment and to have operators in such number that one will always be on duty. The necessary current for wireless operation, while drawn from the generators below, will have to be supplemented by generators on the upper deck run by gas-engines or by storage batteries. Drastic legislation exacting penalties for failure to respond to calls for aid may be enacted, though of course this is very difficult unless the record of wireless operation is absolutely

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

distinct from the same influences that write the ship's log. The whole matter, however, resolves itself into the fact that those who go down to the sea in ships must take risks, and that while a vessel lying at a dock may seem an immense structure, when at sea she becomes a pygmy and the ocean's greatness overwhelming. So while outside influences may in some measure aid in safeguarding ship and passengers, the wisest provisions will be those devoted to making the vessel itself as secure as possible in operation and in perfecting efficiency of equipment.

Nothing so far has developed an argument against the large vessel. It is the writer's opinion that they will increase in size so long as harbor appliances can make room for them, as the larger vessel is economically a better vessel than the smaller one, and a designer can put more in safety, more in comfort, and more in profit in a large vessel than he can in a smaller one.

Just what opinion will prevail for its use on the vessels of the future, from the fact that the turbine-engine-driven boat cannot exert the same backing power that she does in going forward, is a matter of conjecture. When asked my opinion as to the *Mauretania* and *Lusitania* I very frankly said I should prefer three engines like those of the *Kaiser Wilhelm II.*—that is, one amidships and the other two having the usual twin-screw arrangement with the vessel built around the engines and the necessary boilers. This design is well adapted for a transatlantic steamer and one under perfect control at all times. Exactly the way the reciprocating engines of the *Titanic* worked I have not seen, but assume that certain by-pass valves were manipulated to reverse them. Yet this, it would seem, took up too much time, and besides afforded too little effect in backing. There was, of course, a safe speed at which, even with the necessary ripping of the double bottom from the impact, thus causing a dangerous loss of buoyancy, the vessel might not have been damaged seriously, but the tremendous momentum of such a mass, once it struck, would at almost any speed, unless capable of quick and powerful reversing of the engines, have caused fatal injury.

The results of such an accident so far as the ship is concerned are unavoidable. This being the case, the accident must be avoided, or, if this is not done, the life of those on board must be safeguarded as completely as possible.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

There will probably be an extension of the double bottom up the sides, a lifting of transverse bulkheads, fewer water-tight doors, and a rearrangement of construction forward. But the general construction of the metal hull has been a matter of slow evolution, and no effort is spared in making it of ample strength.

Obviously, then, we must concern ourselves principally with the prevention of accident and the saving of life. The main causes of disaster are fire, which includes destruction by lightning; collisions with moving vessels, or with derelicts and icebergs; destruction by time-bombs; and doubtless ships have been destroyed by meteors. Fire on a vessel with numerous passengers is a calamity so frightful in its possible result that it is most carefully guarded against, and fortunately modern steel construction admits, in a degree, of confining the fire. Even now, though, there are not sufficient means to prevent the spread of fire along the upper decks, where the usefulness of water-tight doors is not so evident. Happily the chance of fire is small under present conditions of watchfulness, but nevertheless care should be taken, in the overhaul of laws now under international scrutiny, to look fully into fire prevention. For example, it is perfectly safe to smoke in certain prescribed parts of the vessel, but a whipping-post or stocks should be provided for the man who smokes in his stateroom or keeps matches about him. This may sound overdrawn, but the unburnable ship has no more been produced than the unsinkable ship.

It is claimed that we can receive warning of the presence of icebergs through the temperature of air and water, but with the great speeds of the present day such warning is not to be depended upon.

The eophone is an instrument used to locate objects in fog by echo from the whistle of the ship which carries it, the instrument pointing toward the object making the sound when heard the same in both ears. It was placed on several vessels, but seems not to be generally adopted, although a very efficient equipment. The submarine bell now on most vessels picks up and indicates the direction of sound originating under water. An extension of its use will be to locate bodies echoing sounds originating on the vessel carrying it. As an incentive to radio experts, I suggest a needle which will place itself in the line of waves radiating from another vessel and so point to it. It is probable, too, that a wireless

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

outfit of tension radically different from the main message outfit will be installed for feeling out in thick weather other vessels within a radius of twenty miles. Bells can doubtless be rung by wireless to warn of another vessel's approach.

Icebergs may be encountered quite far south, so that the present practice of adhering to certain lanes, depending upon the season of the year, will doubtless be continued. But vessels, when warned of the presence of ice or while in the ice region during certain seasons, will doubtless be required to slow down in heavy or very dark weather and will close water-tight doors in the principal bulkheads. But how much better to have no doors in them to close!

More attention will be paid to the lookout station in construction and location, and the obvious requirement is that two men be carried there at night and in thick weather, and that proper means be taken to insure that the men continue awake and alert.

The building of vessels of great size and speed calls attention to the fact that, apart from size, there is but little difference in appearance between the vessel of forty years ago and to-day. A radical recast of the above-water structure is necessary to better adapt vessels to great speed in heavy seas, and in such an evolution the safe launching of passengers will have to be given great consideration.

But it is to life-saving appliances on existing vessels that attention is now directed. It takes some knowledge of the sea and its ways to understand the boat question. In placing boats on sea-going vessels many things must be studied. The arrangement of the boats for lowering, the lifting of covers, the removal of the outer chocks upon which the boats rest, the disposition and lead of the falls, getting the passengers into the boats in safety, lowering and releasing, are all matters of first importance. When speaking of the "small boats" of a vessel it must be kept in mind that they are not small. Such boats not only require practice in getting ready to lower, but when lowered down the high sheer side of a liner the greatest skill is required, in breasting off, to keep the boats from smashing against the side and the greatest judgment demanded in releasing them. Boats are not lowered into the water, but are dropped when some distance above it, and if dropped at the wrong instant are apt to be thrown against the side. No boats should hereafter be carried on curved davits when stowed inboard. A

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

few boats for quick lowering may be carried on such davits already swung out, but davits of the Welin type should be required for the regular ship's boats. The *Titanic* went down in a quiet sea, but had there been even a moderate sea on the casualties would have been much greater. There should be boat and raft accommodation enough for every one on board, and that we may have this on existing ships many more boats must be carried. The unsinkable life-boat is the best where it can be carried all ready to lower. But the conditions of the *Titanic* accident may be seldom reproduced, and a list to one side, for example, would soon render lowering from the other side impossible. The collapsible type with substantial wooden bottom is a good emergency substitute when life-boats enough cannot be carried at davits. The life-rafts have great value, but they should be made much larger than at present. To stand fifty feet in the air and look down into cold, dark water tries the nerves in a way to deter many from jumping into the sea even with life-belts. This difficulty might be overcome if chutes were constructed running down the sides, something like the usual ship's gangway, which delivered those using them well clear of the vessel to be picked up. Such means would seem preferable to being lowered in a heavy sea. The handling of boats by power-derricks is not desirable, as the power supplied from below may fail. Large boats, housed over, in which passengers could be stowed away till the boat had been hoisted clear and dropped into the water would be safer if power-lifting could be depended upon, and these could have their own motive power, for it is a safe assertion that many more men can run an automobile engine than can pull an oar. Eventually all the ships' life-boats will be fitted as motor-boats. A short time ago a steamer plying on the Mediterranean fitted one of its life-boats with a standard motor and coupled the motor to a dynamo as well as to the screw, with a view to furnishing power for wireless work if the main plant gave out.

Of course there is no excuse if the boats are not properly fitted and all automata in perfect working order. There comes a time when the wooden life-boats may leak, and many vessels carry metal life-boats. The ordinary canvas folding-boat does not secure the confidence of sea-going men, though very good for inland water navigation.

In the confusion following an accident it is very hard to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

get people into the proper boats. Many ways will be adopted before the best practice is secured. But we should, at any rate, begin with giving every passenger a card stating the number of his life-boat and a printed request that he take an early opportunity to inspect the boat. As soon as possible on the voyage there should be a boat drill, the passengers being urged to witness it and a few asked to take their places in the boats. While legislation will be drastic and compelling, it is to be hoped it will be general enough to encourage improvement in life-saving equipment.

In future it would be desirable if in large vessels a part of the vessel aft were built with metal top and bottom and so secured that it could be launched overboard as a floating pontoon or raft in case the vessel sinks. In such structure there could be a small wireless outfit and some provisions in a concentrated form.

Another means of safeguarding has been proposed—namely, the sailing of vessels in pairs—but this plan does not seem to have much to commend it. As a rule, lines do not add new vessels in such numbers as to render this possible, and to couple up an old vessel with a new one simply reduces the new to the level of the old.

Safety at sea will be greater as an outcome of the accident, but progress must not be barred as a result, and in connection with inland water navigation it is to be remembered that much is properly permitted which could not be allowed on the ocean.

We have in our battle-ships devices to show when water enters compartments, and by simple and economical devices it would be possible to have the depth to which water has risen indicated on the bridge, and on merchantmen as well as on our men-of-war search-lights should be carried.

Vessels will be made progressively better, stronger, safer, and speedier. Luxury and comfort are not in themselves bad, but travelers have a right to expect that they are added by the naval designer after providing every proper device for safety. We have had a sad awakening to the fact that, while we have applauded progress and improvement in ocean liners during this generation, laws affecting their management in the interest of the traveling public have not kept pace with advance in construction.

LEWIS NIXON.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"THE GREAT ILLUSION"

A REPLY TO REAR-ADMIRAL A. T. MAHAN

BY NORMAN ANGELL

In the March number of The North American Review, Rear-Admiral Mahan has stated the reasons which prompt him to regard the thesis I have elaborated and the conclusions drawn therefrom in *The Great Illusion* as erroneous. These conclusions are, briefly, that as between civilized nations it is impossible for one to achieve anything of material or moral worth by the exercise of physical force upon the other; that war as between such nations is futile in that the victor, even when completely successful, cannot by virtue of his victory advance his moral or material well-being; that we have passed out of that stage of development in which it is possible to settle the conflicts of civilized men—whether those conflicts are of an economic or moral origin—by means of military force.

Admiral Mahan dissents for two reasons—one major and the other minor. His major reason is that *The Great Illusion* "regards the world as governed by material self-interest."

> "The purpose of armaments in the minds of those maintaining them is not primarily economical advantage, in the sense of depriving a neighboring State of its own, or fear of such consequence to itself through the deliberate aggression of a rival having that particular end in view. . . . The fundamental proposition of the book is a mistake. Nations are under no illusion as to the unprofitableness of war in itself. . . . The entire conception of the work is itself an illusion based upon a profound misreading of human action. To regard the world as governed by self-interest only is to live in a non-existent world, an ideal world, a world possessed by an idea much less worthy than those which mankind, to do it bare justice, persistently entertains."

It is somewhat astonishing that a work as irrelevant as all this to the practical problems of international politics should have received from Admiral Mahan the very con-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

siderable attention he has devoted to it. But is the economic motive as a factor of international struggle quite as unimportant and secondary as the foregoing passage would imply? How does Admiral Mahan reconcile the emphatic dogmatism of the foregoing passage as to the inoperative nature of self-interest in the struggle between nations with his own statement of the case which I take from one of his books hardly yet four years old—*The Interest of America in International Conditions*? He writes:

"It is as true now as when Washington penned the words, and will always be true, that it is vain to expect nations to act consistently from any motive other than that of interest. This under the name of Realism is the frankly avowed motive of German statecraft. It follows from this directly that the study of interests, international interests, is the one basis of sound, and provident, policy for statesmen. . . .

"The old predatory instinct, that he should take who has the power, survives, . . . and moral force is not sufficient to determine issues unless supported by physical. Governments are corporations, and corporations have not souls, . . . must put first the lawful interests, of their own wards, their own people. Such preeminence forces a nation to seek markets, and where possible to control them to its own advantage by preponderant force, the ultimate expression of which is possession, . . . an inevitable link in a chain of logical sequences: Industry, markets, control, navy, bases."

Admiral Mahan has, it is true, anticipated the presentation of this parallel by pleading the complex nature of human nature (which no one denies). "Bronze is copper and bronze is tin," he says. But he entirely overlooks the fact that if one withholds copper or one withholds tin it is no longer bronze. The author of *The Great Illusion* has never taken the ground that all international action can be explained in the terms of one narrow motive. He does take the ground that if you can profoundly modify the bearing of a constituent so important as that to which Admiral Mahan himself in his own work attributed great importance, you will profoundly modify the whole texture and character of international relations.

Even were it true, therefore, that the thesis in *The Great Illusion* is as narrowly economical as the criticism I have quoted would imply, it would nevertheless have on Admiral Mahan's own showing a very profound bearing on the problems of international statecraft.

But as a matter of simple fact the thesis in question does not postulate any such narrow conception of human motive.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Although the public seem to have centered their attention on that section of the book which deals with the financial and economical aspect, that aspect, even in sheer bulk, does not represent more than a third of it. It is not, as its critics would have us believe, a money-lender's gospel; it does not discredit moral effort, and, ineffective as it may be in execution, the intention was to show the bearing of warfare, not upon the interest of stock-brokers and money-lenders, but upon the interests of mankind. A general truth or principle may be stated in various terms, but you cannot separate a problem of interest from a problem of right or morality in the absolute fashion that Admiral Mahan would imply, because right and morality postulate the protection and promotion of the general interest.

A nation, a people, we are given to understand, have higher motives than money or "self-interest." What do we mean when we speak of the money of a nation or the self-interest of a community? We mean—and in such a discussion as this mean nothing else—better conditions for the great mass of the people; the fullest possible lives; the abolition or attenuation of poverty and destitution; not merely that the millions shall be better housed and clothed and fed, capable of provision for sickness and old age, with lives prolonged and cheered; not merely this, but also that they shall be better educated, with character disciplined by steady labor and a better use of leisure, a general social atmosphere which shall make possible family affection, individual dignity and courtesy and the graces of life, not alone among the few, but among the many.

Now, do these things constitute a worthy national policy, an inspiring aim of statesmanship, or not? Yet they are, speaking in terms of communities, pure self-interest—all bound up with economic problems, with money. Does Admiral Mahan mean us to take him at his word when he would attach to such efforts the same discredit that one implies in talking of a mercenary individual? Would he have us believe that the typical great movements of our times—Socialism, Trade Unionism, Syndicalism, Insurance Bills, Land Laws, Old-age Pensions, Charity Organization, Improved Education—bound up as they all are with economic problems, are not the sort of objects which more and more are absorbing the best activities of Christendom?

What are the activities which lie outside the range of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

those things? Are they ever likely to constitute a cause of struggle between nations? Religion? Religion, it is true, was a motive drenching Europe with blood during some hundreds of years, but the last real war of religion in Europe ended with the Peace of Westphalia. A question of honor, the avenging of some "insult"? Yes, that may yet drive a nation into war because the code of morals which rules the relations of nations lags behind the code which dominates the relations of individuals, and for that reason the morality of the duel, long since abandoned as between individuals in the best type of human society, still obtains as between nations. Englishmen of the eighteenth century would have scorned the idea that a personal insult could ever have any other solution than the field of honor; to urge the contrary was to show oneself either craven or ignorant of human nature. Yet the duel has disappeared. "Honor," even that which cannot be taken to the courts, is just as well protected without it; and Anglo-Saxon civilization is not craven; it is not worse for the disappearance of the duel; it is better. International conduct will show a like development.

I have attempted in my book roughly to indicate the process at work in these developments, to show that in the changing character of men's ideals there is a distinct narrowing of the gulf which is supposed to separate ideal aims and those of self-interest. Early ideals, whether in the field of politics or religion, are generally disassociated from any aim of general well-being. In early politics ideals are concerned simply with personal allegiance to some dynastic chief, a feudal lord or a monarch. The well-being of a community does not enter into the matter at all. Later the chief must embody in his person that well-being or he does not achieve the allegiance of a community of any enlightenment; later the well-being of the community becomes the end in itself without being embodied in the person of any hereditary chief; the community realize that their efforts, instead of being directed to the protection of the individual interests of some chief, are, as a matter of fact, directed to the protection of their own interests, and their altruism has become self-interest, since self-sacrifice of a community for the sake of the community is a contradiction in terms. In the religious sphere a like development has been shown. Primitive religious ideals have no relation to the material

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

betterment of mankind. The early Christian thought it meritorious to live a sterile life at the top of a pillar eaten by vermin, as the Hindoo saint to-day thinks it meritorious to live an equally sterile life upon a bed of spikes. But as the early Christian ideal progressed, sacrifices having no purpose connected with the betterment of mankind lost their appeal. Our admiration now goes, not to the recluse who does nothing for mankind, but rather to the priest who would give his life to bring a ray of comfort to a leper settlement. The Christian saint who would allow the nails of his fingers to grow through the palms of his clasped hands would excite, not our admiration, but our revolt. More and more is religious effort being subjected to this test: Does it make for the improvement of society? If not it stands condemned. Political ideals will inevitably be more and more subjected to a like test. I am aware that very often at present they are not so subjected. Dominated, as our political thought is, by Roman and feudal imagery—hypnotized by symbols and analogues which the necessary development of organized society has rendered obsolete—the ideals even of democracies are still often pure abstractions, divorced from any purpose calculated to advance the moral or material betterment of mankind. The craze for sheer size of territory, simple extent of administrative area, is still deemed a thing deserving immense, incalculable sacrifices. Because a Roman province was in a true sense a "possession" of the central Roman state, because a population was in some real sense "owned" by a feudal chief, we still talk as though one self-governing community could "own" another self-governing community and that annexation in some unexplained way is an addition to the wealth of the annexing state—as though the wealth of a people depended upon the size of the administrative area which they happened to inhabit, as though the population of London were necessarily better off than the population of Philadelphia, because London is a bigger city; or as though Londoners would increase their wealth by "annexing" the County of Kent. And yet even these ideals, firmly set as they are in our language and tradition, are rapidly yielding to the necessary force of events. A generation ago it would have been inconceivable that a people or a monarch should calmly see part of its country secede and establish itself as a separate political entity without attempting to prevent it

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

by force of arms. Yet this is what happened but a year or two since in the Scandinavian peninsula. For forty years Germany has added to the difficulties of the European situation and to her own for the purpose of including Alsace and Lorraine in its federation, but even there, obeying the tendency which is world-wide, an attempt has been made at the creation of a constitutional and autonomous government. The history of the British Empire for fifty years has been a process of undoing the work of conquest. England, which for centuries has made such sacrifices to retain Ireland, is now making great sacrifices in order to make her secession workable. To all political arrangements, to all political ideals, this final test will be applied: Does it or does it not make for the widest interests of the mass of the people involved?

And it is to that test that I have subjected warfare as between nations. In applying it I have used terms that I thought would be most familiar to a busy and occupied world, largely those of the market-place, because those would make the essence of these problems understandable to the workaday mass to whom a problem set in purely moral terms might not appeal; not from any moral recalcitrance, but because the hard pressure of their working lives would make economic terms easier of comprehension.

It is possible that Admiral Mahan might rejoin with another distinction. He might urge that, though these questions all had more or less their origin in or were bound up with economic problems, the economic question becomes itself a moral question, a question of right: it was not the few pence of the ship tax that Hampden fought about, but the question of right which its payment involved. So with nations; war, ineffective to achieve an economic end, unprofitable in the sense that the cost involved in the defense of a given economic point exceeds its monetary value, will still be fought because a point trifling in the economic sense is all-important from the view of right.

That objection would be perfectly valid if the moral divisions of men, even those arising out of economic conflict, coincided with their political divisions; but they do not. The physical division of labor between nations due to the developed means of communication has set up not merely an economic interdependence, so cut athwart political frontiers as to render the great industrial nations, like Eng-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

land and Germany, no longer economic units (Lancashire being economically far more a part of Louisiana, a section of a foreign State, than it is of Dorsetshire, a section of the same State), but out of that condition has grown an intellectual interdependence; nations are no longer moral and intellectual units. The moral divisions of men no longer coincide with the political and national divisions; so that national armies can no longer embody the moral rivalries. Religious wars came to an end because as religious differences came to intersect political frontiers there was produced a condition in which no state could be regarded as purely Catholic or purely Protestant, and we had a Catholic France allied with a Protestant Sweden. The struggle in the form of military rivalry between States was ridiculous and came to an end.

If there is any ideal motive prompting English hostility to Germany, that motive is in some way connected with English ideals of personal freedom and parliamentary government; but it would be impossible to advance those ideals by warfare, for the simple reason that the real fight for them must necessarily be carried on inside the German frontiers by Germans and can be advanced in no other way. For a foreign nation to challenge Germany on behalf of such ideals would compel Germans now fighting for such to abandon that fight and to fight as patriots against those in sympathy with them. The net result of such a war, however it might go, would be to set back the struggle now going on in Germany.

So much for Admiral Mahan's major objection. His minor objection appears to be roughly embodied in the following passage:

"Even on the ground of self-interest only, the argument appears overstrained. . . . I had occasion several years ago to look somewhat extensively into the economical and financial conditions of Great Britain toward the end of the Napoleonic wars. They were dismal; but it is true none the less that those of the Continent were so much worse that Great Britain owed the long start which she held and kept to this cause largely, of course not solely, for a single reason rarely accounts for all the phenomena of a social order.

"Great Britain owed her superiority then to the armed control of the sea, which had sheltered her commercial and industrial fabric from molestation by the enemy; while by the same means she crushed the prosperity of France, disabling her from utilizing her rich resources in the processes of commercial exchange. . . . As the result of the war between France and Germany in 1870, Germany acquired territory and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

a huge indemnity. These were direct results. She received also the final impulse to national unity, consummated in the formal institution of the German Empire. . . . On the other hand, German national unity has assured, throughout the countries thus confederated into one empire, the development of an economical and industrial system which, among other effects, has resulted in reducing emigration from some 200,000, in 1879, to 25,000 yearly now; although, coincident with this diminution, the population is increasing by 800,000 annually."

Now I have attempted to show that the respective weight of the factors in international development have changed radically, not merely since the Napoleonic era, but since the days of the Franco-German War. Presumably Admiral Mahan rejects this part of my thesis, since he reverts to the facts of the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries.

Not only does the foregoing passage imply that military power must play roughly the same rôle in commercial and industrial development now as then (otherwise it would be irrelevant to cite these historical facts), but that a nation is advantaged by damage to its neighbors or that a nation will be prepared to fight merely for the sake of seeing a neighbor suffer a worse loss than itself.

In attempting to sketch the progression away from the methods of physical force I indicated certain facts of historical development. The earliest form of overseas enterprise— of "sea-power"—was simple piracy, like that of the Northmen, whose only notion of deriving profit from that power was to ravage an enemy's coast and to squeeze the population for danegeld. The struggle for colonial expansion after the discovery of the New World took a somewhat less crude form, but was still bound up with the exercise of sheer political and military force. And now industrial and commercial expansion has got beyond even that stage: that expansion is no longer dependent upon the political power of the particular people who may be seeking it. I have stated the case thus:

"What was the problem confronting the merchant adventurer of the sixteenth century? Here were newly discovered lands containing, as he believed, precious metals and stones and spices, inhabited by savages or semi-savages. If other traders got those stones or precious metals, it was quite evident that he could not. His colonial policy therefore had to be directed to two ends: firstly, to such effective political occupation of the country as to keep the savage or semi-savage population in check; and, secondly, to prevent other nations from searching for this wealth and precious metals, since if they obtained it he could not. That is the story of the French and Dutch in India, of the Spanish in South America.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

But as soon as there grew up in those countries an organized community living in the country itself the whole problem changed. The colonies then have a value to the mother-country mainly as a market and a source of food and raw material, and if their value in those respects is to be developed to the full, they inevitably become self-governing communities in a greater or lesser degree, and the mother-country exploits them just as she exploits any other community with which she may be in relation. Germany might acquire Canada, but it could no longer ever be a question of her taking Canada's wealth in precious metals or in any other form to the exclusion of other nations. If Germany 'owned' Canada, she would have to own it in the same way that the English do. The Germans would have to pay for every sack of wheat and for every pound of beef they might buy just as if Canada belonged to England or to anybody else. Germany could not have even the meager satisfaction of Germanizing those great communities, for every one knows that they are too firmly 'set.' Their language, law, morals, would have to remain; so that after conquest Germany would find that German Canada was pretty much the same Canada as it is now; a country where Germans are free to go and do go, which is now a field for Germany's expanding population and for Germany's overseas trade. As a matter of fact, Germany feeds her expanding population from territories like Canada and the United States without going there. The era of emigration for Germany has stopped because the compound steam-engine has rendered emigration largely unnecessary."

Admiral Mahan does not deal with the historical development I have indicated here except to imply that such development does not affect the field of practical politics because the events of 1911—the Franco-German conflict over Morocco, the accentuation of the Anglo-German conflict, the invasion of Tripoli by Italy—show that the old factors of international conflict are still operative.

These events show nothing at all except that political opinion in Europe is still dominated by the old conceptions; that the public opinion which gives the motive force to the action of governments is still carried along on the momentum of old ideas—which it was the object of my book to show. At the bottom of the whole struggle of 1911—not merely the diplomatic struggle in which France, England, and Germany were engaged, but the actual military conflict which has been precipitated as between Italy and Turkey—was the European contest for African territory. That contest has not only provoked one war, but brought war for three other great nations within measurable distance. Whatever be the outcome, one thing is certain: immense burdens will be added to the already heavy one carried by the five or six nations concerned; for two or three hundred millions of people in Europe life with all its problems of high prices,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

labor wars, unsolved social difficulties will be made harder still. One would assume, therefore, that this struggle for African territory was bound up with the "primordial needs" of the three or four hundred millions concerned. Well, the simple truth is that it misses those needs altogether, as the history of the last twenty or thirty years most plainly shows.

The national future and welfare of France would not have suffered one whit had Morocco passed under the administration of Germany; Germany's real expansion, the activities by which her people gain their livelihood, have not in the past and will not in the future depend upon the acquisition of tropical colonies. The prosperity of Italy, if the experience of France, the most successful African colonizer in Europe, is any guide, will not be advanced by the conquest of Tripoli; it is likely to be diminished.

Dogmatic as these assertions may sound, they are borne out by facts from which there is no escape. Both Italy and Germany are trying to follow in the African footsteps of France. Let us see exactly what that sort of national development means, as illustrated to us in the case of Tunis, one of the most successful instances of the sort of development about which the whole conflict of 1911 raged. I have summarized that history elsewhere as follows:

"In thirty years, at a cost of many million sterling (it is part of successful colonial administration in France never to let it be known what the colonies really cost), France has founded in Tunis a colony, in which to-day there are, excluding soldiers and officials, about 25,000 genuine French colonists: just the number by which the French population in France—the real France—is diminishing every six months! And the value of Tunis as a market does not even amount to the sum which France spends directly on its occupation and administration, to say nothing of the indirect extension of military burden which its conquest involved; and, of course, the market which it represents would still exist in some form, though England—or even Germany—administered the country.

"In other words, France loses twice every year in her home population a colony equivalent to Tunis—if we measure colonies in terms of communities made up of the race which has sprung from the mother-country. And yet, if once in a generation her rulers and diplomats can point out to 25,000 Frenchmen living artificially and exotically under conditions which must in the long run be inimical to their race, it is pointed to as 'expansion' and as evidence that France is maintaining her position as a Great Power. A few years, as history goes, unless there is some complete change of tendencies which at present seem as strong as ever, the French race as we now know it will have ceased to exist,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

swamped without the firing, maybe, of a single shot, by the Germans, Belgians, English, Italians, and Jews. There are to-day in France more Germans than there are Frenchmen in all the colonies that France has acquired in the last half-century, and German trade with France outweighs enormously the trade of France with all French colonies. France is to-day a better colony for the Germans than they could make of any exotic colony which France owns.

"'They *tell* me,' said a French deputy recently (in a not quite original *mot*), 'that the Germans are at Agadir. I *know* they are in the Champs-Elysées.' Which, of course, is in reality a much more serious matter.

"And on the other side we are to assume that Germany has during the period of France's expansion—since the war—not expanded at all. That she has been throttled and cramped—that she has not had her place in the sun; and that is why she must fight for it and endanger the security of her neighbors.

"Well, I put it to you that all this in reality is false: that Germany has not been cramped or throttled; that, on the contrary, as we recognize when we get away from the mirage of the map, her expansion has been the wonder of the world. She has added 20,000,000 to her population—one-half the present population of France—during a period in which the French population has actually diminished. Of all the nations in Europe, she has cut the biggest swath in the development of world trade, industry, and influence. Despite the fact that she has not 'expanded' in the sense of mere political dominion, a proportion of her population, equivalent to the white population of the whole colonial British Empire, make their living, or the best part of it, from the development and exploitation of territory outside her borders. These facts are not new; they have been made the text of thousands of political sermons preached in England itself during the last few years; but one side of their significance seems to have been missed.

"We get, then, this: On the one side a nation extending enormously its political dominion and yet diminishing in national force, if by national force we mean the growth of a sturdy, enterprising, vigorous people. (I am not denying that France is both wealthy and comfortable, to a greater degree it may be than her rival; but she has not her colonies to thank for it—quite the contrary.) On the other side, we get immense expansion expressed in terms of those things—a growing and vigorous population and the possibility of feeding them—and yet the political dominion, speaking practically, has hardly been extended at all.

"Such a condition of things, if the common jargon of high politics means anything, is preposterous. It takes nearly all meaning out of most that we hear about 'primordial needs' and the rest of it.

"As a matter of fact, we touch here one of the vital confusions, which is at the bottom of most of the present political trouble between nations, and shows the power of the old ideas and the old phraseology.

"In the days of the sailing-ship and the lumbering wagon dragging slowly over all but impassable roads, for one country to derive any considerable profit from another, it had practically to administer it politically. But the compound steam-engine, the railway, the telegraph, have profoundly modified the elements of the whole problem. In the modern world political dominion is playing a more and more effaced rôle as a

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

factor in commerce; the non-political factors have in practice made it all but inoperative. It is the case with every modern nation actually that the outside territories which it exploits most successfully are precisely those of which it does not 'own' a foot. Even with the most characteristically colonial of all—Great Britain—the greater part of her oversea trade is done with countries which she makes no attempt to 'own,' control, coerce, or dominate—and incidentally she has ceased to do any of those things with her colonies.

"Millions of Germans in Prussia and Westphalia derive profit or make their living out of countries to which their political dominion in no way extends. The modern German exploits South America by remaining at home. Where, forsaking this principle, he attempts to work through political power, he approaches futility. German colonies are colonies *'pour rire.'* The Government has to bribe Germans to go to them; her trade with them is microscopic; and if the twenty millions who have been added to Germany's population since the war had had to depend on their country's political conquest, they would have had to starve. What feeds them are countries which Germany has never 'owned' and never hopes to 'own': Brazil, Argentina, the United States, India, Australia, Canada, Russia, France, and England. (Germany, which never spent a mark on its political conquest, to-day draws more tribute from South America than does Spain, which has poured out mountains of treasure and oceans of blood in its conquest.) These are Germany's real colonies. Yet the immense interests which they represent, of really primordial concern to Germany, without which so many of her people would be actually without food, are for the diplomats and the soldiers quite secondary ones; the immense trade which they represent owes nothing to the diplomat, to Agadir incidents, to Dreadnoughts; it is the unaided work of the merchant and the manufacturer. All this diplomatic and military conflict and rivalry, the waste of wealth, the unspeakable foulness which Tripoli is revealing, are reserved for things which both sides to the quarrel could sacrifice, not merely without loss, but with profit."

As a matter of fact, it is a very superficial reading of the events of 1911 which would prompt the conclusion that the facts of the world are not bringing home to peoples and governments the changing character of the relations of nations.

It is perfectly true that the Napoleonic policy was directed at crushing England, England's at crushing France, just as France in 1870, fearing the development of Germany, tried to prevent it and was successfully challenged. After the war German policy was directed at crippling France, not merely as a political, but as an economic factor in international struggle. But the law of progression in these matters is illustrated by this fact: Bismarck was nearer to being able to apply the methods of Attila, nearly 1,500 years removed from him, than was Bismarck's successor, Herr von

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Kiderlen Waechter, to being able to apply the methods of Bismarck from whom only forty years separated him. Where Bismarck could have bled France white with a certain satisfaction without any immediate danger being involved to his own country, Herr von Kiderlen Waechter learned that to bleed white this relatively feeble France of 1911 would be to plunge this great and powerful Germany into dire economic distress. What American cotton had been to Lancashire in 1865, French money, and all that it directly and indirectly represents, was to German industry in 1911. He learned that of the twenty million souls added to the German population since 1870 nearly all of them were dependent upon foreign food, and gained their livelihood from industries dependent to a large extent upon foreign capital, most of it French and English capital; and that if by some magic the ultimate Bismarckian dream of wiping France economically from the map of Europe could be realized, he would have been prevented and, indeed, was prevented from so doing, not by any consideration for French welfare, but by the very pressing necessities of German industry and by the direct influence of German financiers and German business men. Not only has the work of the German people unintentionally brought to naught the carefully laid plans of the statesman, but modern Germany would have been impossible unless those plans had miscarried. It was Bismarck's declared policy from first to last to check, by every possible means, the economic development of France. She was to be blotted out as an economic factor in Europe. Well, if she had been, the wonderful development of German commerce in the last twenty years would have been impossible.

That commerce is largely with such countries as South America, the Near East, Russia, and the recent development of those countries which makes the large German trade possible is due mainly to French and English capital. If German statesmen had really been able to wipe out Germany's rivals, this development of German trade would have been impossible.

And all the efforts of French statesmen to control these currents have on their side been just as futile. French policy was aimed at fortifying Russia to counterbalance Germany, and with that purpose an alliance with Russia was formed, an integral part of the understanding being that

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

a portion of the immense free capital of France should be available for Russia. The capital was given with the result that German trade in Russia, thanks to development due in no small measure to this French capital, has gone up from about fifteen to forty-five per cent., and Germany may be said to-day commercially to dominate Russia. It is one of the great outlets for German industrial and commercial activity—thanks to the very policy which was aimed against Germany.

And note this: that with the freedom of communication in every sense that now exists in the world, it has become a material impossibility to prevent French money aiding German trade in one form or another. So long as France, with a stationary population and large amounts of free capital, desires interest on her money, so long as the French father desires to give to his daughter a *dot,* so long, in other words, as France achieves in some measure those aims for which mainly the state exists at all, her money will go to the help of German trade.

The true inwardness of Admiral Mahan's criticism of *The Great Illusion* is to be found, not so much perhaps in the article which he devotes directly to the book, as in the preceding articles in this REVIEW, in which he deals with "The Place of Force in International Relations," and his discussion of this subject is marked by exactly the sort of limitation which generally marks it in the case of militarist writers. A problem involving necessarily two parties and two groups of factors—defense and attack—is made in terms of one party and one group of factors, that of the defense. Thus in the passage which I have quoted Admiral Mahan argues that Great Britain's superiority of armaments sheltered her commercial and industrial fabric from molestation by the enemy, giving her security of development. Therefore, he argues, military force is economically advantageous. The argument is, of course, fallacious: it is not military force which gave her the advantage, but the fact that she was able to prevent the employment of military force against her.

If there had been no military force at all in the case, if Europe had not believed in force as a means of achieving the ends of men, England would have been more secure still and all her neighbors would have enjoyed a like security. In attempting to test the practical value of any principle of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

this kind we must note its total result when applied by all the parties involved, and if that simple test is applied all Admiral Mahan's elaborate arguments in favor of force fall to the ground.

The problem before us, the question out of which *The Great Illusion* and this whole discussion has grown, is this: "What ought the nations of Europe to do in the matter of the employment of force the one against the other?" And if the question is put in that form, the only form in which it can be put when we are talking as we are with reference to principles applicable generally to European civilization, it is evident that the plea in favor of force even in the Napoleonic era cannot be maintained. If the general tradition of Europe had been against the employment of force, and such tradition had dominated its policy, not only would the security of England and her freedom in industrial and commercial development have been greater even than it was, and the like security of her neighbors greater, but the whole European race, instead of being weakened by the destruction of some three million of its best selected lives, leaving the stock to be perpetuated by its worst elements, would have been infinitely better than it is, with a greater capacity for improvement; and the incalculable amount of life and wealth and energy that has gone into mutual destruction would have gone into making good that improvement. The world would have been a better place, inhabited by a racially better people.

Without force, argues Admiral Mahan, the purpose of the Holy Alliance could not have been defeated; Napoleon III. could not have been expelled from Mexico, Spain from Cuba, nor the encroachment of Russia resisted in the Far East. Again, of course, the real argument should be: If Spain had not believed in just those doctrines against which *The Great Illusion* is a protest—believed, that is, that the use of force against distant communities for the purposes of spoliation was better than the free co-operation of independent communities—the Spanish colonies would have approximated more to the English type and there would have been no need either of the Monroe doctrine or of the Spanish-American War. Russia would be devoting her energies to internal development instead of sterile territorial expansion, and the patriotism of the Japanese, not called into existence by the need of defense, would have been diverted more to internal development and less to a military pride which menaces bet-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ter civilizations. And the only way to prevent that is this: for the nations of Europe to realize that they are a community, and that a community can only exist by virtue of the units composing it surrendering the use of force the one as against the other. And the necessary precedent of such realization is the mutual conception of the superiority of co-operation to conflict, the existence of that "communal sense" which is the necessary precedent of civilization in any sphere, national or international.

You cannot get communal sense enough even in the pirate crew unless they surrender the use of force as between themselves, act by agreement, and co-operate against their victim, their prey. The prey of civilization is Nature, the Planet, and unless the units which make up, or ought to make up, the community of Europe give up preying the one upon the other, and co-operate in the attack upon their prey, that attack will by so much suffer.

Inside the political frontiers this general recognition that the exercise of force as between the individuals composing the community must, in the individual's own interest, be surrendered, is now fairly achieved. The next step of human progress is to render the application of that principle complete.

Admiral Mahan retorts that the individuals within the frontier have surrendered the use of force by compulsion of the police; but he skips an essential step—indeed, he skips several essential steps—in the creation of the police. The police exist by virtue of the fact that the individuals of the community have so far surrendered force as to agree upon the creation of a police and upon the fashion in which and the purpose for which, it should be employed; and until you get this suspension of individual conflict in favor of common action the police is an impossibility. If each individual had said: "I do not want the judgment of the community: it may be wrong; I will depend upon my personal strength to vindicate my right; I know more of my affairs than does the community; I will not co-operate with the community to form the police," there would never have been a police—indeed, there would have been no organized society.

And Admiral Mahan, if not directly, at least by implication, encourages the individual—the individual nation, that is—so to stand out and so take that attitude because, he says, the interests and ideals of the individual are in conflict.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Not merely does Admiral Mahan ignore the fact that the very difficulties which he mentions as being only solvable by force have arisen by the blind faith of men in force, but he writes as though the force provoked in reply to force had succeeded where reason had failed. But force answers no questions and solves no problems. Its outcome is an accident. It is irrelevant to the question of right, and there is no guarantee that might shall always or generally be on the side of right. It takes the cynicism of Napoleon to declare that "Providence is always on the side of the strong battalions." Force is even more accidental than that—fortuitous circumstance might place it on the side of the weak battalions. Thus: I am in conflict with some one, we lose our tempers and have a duel, and because my eyesight is better than that of my opponent I kill him with a pistol-shot. Who was right in the original dispute? What has the result proved except that my eyesight is better? The most magnificent and marvelous exhibition of force in history, that of Napoleon, broke down; and in its failure I believe the biographer of Nelson rejoices. If this wonderful instance of the exercise of force teaches anything at all, it is that force is necessarily futile; and that one lesson it teaches badly, because the psychological result of the employment of force is generally to swamp reason in favor of temper in those against whom it is employed and to distort the character of its rôle in human relationship. Europe did not draw the lesson from that episode that Napoleonic aims and methods were fundamentally wrong, that the unification of Europe—if that was Napoleon's aim—can only come by the free co-operation of the units composing it. On the contrary, the outcome is an attempt to repeat the Napoleonic display of force in a slightly different form. Napoleon's aggression started Germany on the road to militarism, the full fruits of which Europe is now beginning to gather. Prussianism now threatens Europe somewhat in the same way that Napoleonism threatened it in the past.* Germany is to take "the leadership of Europe" by military predominance, as France was to have done a hundred years

* This general tendency has received suggestive expression in General von Bernhardi's book—*Deutschland und der nachste Krieg*. One of his chapters is headed "The Duty to Make War." He describes the peace movement in Germany as "poisonous," and proclaims the doctrine that the duties and tasks of the German people cannot be accomplished save by the sword. "The duty of self-assertion is by no means ex-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ago; and Europe will presumably reply by force; and then some other nation will aspire to the "leadership of Europe," and the old obsession will dominate the mind and absorb the energies between civilization and savagery. The fact of organized society is standing proof that individuals do not sacrifice their interests when they surrender their right to the use of force the one against the other in favor of common action to be determined by reason and agreement between them. Men's interests are not sacrificed by co-operation; they are advanced by it, and if this principle is true in the case of individual men, it gains in force a hundredfold in the case of nations. And if Admiral Mahan retorts that it is not a question of conflicting interests between nations, but of conflicting ideals, I would reply that ideals which survive by the accident of force are not likely to be superior to those which survive through the process of reason and discussion.

Admiral Mahan says:

"The great objection to law, however, is not merely that it is inadequate, but that in most of the cases it inequitably perpetuates injustice by sanctioning outworn conditions or inapplicable principles."

But exactly the same objection could be applied to the municipal, the internal law of nations. Such have often in the past been monstrous, and they were improved by discussion, agitation, education, the recognition of the general advantage—a recognition arrived at through the free play of the thousand and one factors which make for the real progress of men, not by a resort to force, by having the

hausted in the mere repelling of hostile attacks. It includes the needs of securing to the whole people which the state embraces the possibility of existence and development." It is desirable, declares the author, that conquest shall be effected by war, and not by peaceful means; Silesia would not have had the same value for Prussia if Frederick the Great had obtained it from an Arbitration Court. The attempt to abolish war is, declares the author, not only immoral and unworthy of a community, "it is an attempt to deprive man of his highest possession—the right to stake physical life for ideal ends. The German people must learn to see that the maintenance of peace cannot and must never be the goal of policy."

The armament party in England is urging that the only possible reply to this sort of thing is the increase of armaments. That exactly suits the Bernhardi school. That increase of armaments will be used by them to justify their theories and to discredit all opponents to it. The real reply is to find means of creating an enlightened opinion in Europe which shall see the sophistry and danger of this philosophy of force.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

individuals who suffer by a bad law fight out their differences by physical combat—that is a step from civilization to anarchy, and in the case of the community within the frontier universally recognized as such.

Admiral Mahan may say it is not a question of what might be best, but of what exists, and I would reply: What exists depends on us—upon the action of each individual. What exists in this matter is not something fixed outside our acts and our volition, it is the reflection of those acts, and without those individual acts there can be no salvation.

What prompts those individual acts, of course, is a realization, however imperfect, on the part of the individual of the advantages which he gains by co-operation with his fellows; of the superiority of such a method to conflict, the creation, in other words, of a "communal sense" by a growing understanding of the real nature of human relationship. And until you have this in however feeble a degree you cannot get communal action: you could not even get two cannibals to agree to co-operate against a third instead of fighting each other until they see the advantages of so doing, which is a process of reason and discussion. And reason and understanding must precede international co-operation: international politics must embody more and more the general realization of certain principles, or corporate progress is not possible. Those principles I have tried to enunciate. But Admiral Mahan, if he does not deprecate, at least does not encourage, that attitude which would make the individual—the individual nation, that is—part of a community. He urges that the community of nations will in some wonderful way reverse the process which has produced the communities of men; that the isolation of units employing force the one against the other is a safer road of progress than that of a completer co-operation which looks to the abandoning of force in favor of agreement and a common end determined by reason and discussion. And this, with whatever sophistry or eloquence it may be urged, is the doctrine of savagery.

NORMAN ANGELL.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

LETTERS OF SAMUEL MORSE—1812

BY EDWARD L. MORSE

I

We shall celebrate in this month of June the one-hundredth anniversary of the declaration of the War of 1812. Much will be written about it and many celebrations will be held commemorative of the American heroes of that war, the last, let us hope, between the two great English-speaking nations. It may, therefore, not be amiss to record the impressions of a young American who was during all that troubled time pursuing his studies in the peaceful art of painting in London; impressions expressed at great length and in forceful language to his parents and friends on this side.

He was a young man of great strength of character, impulsive, and yet of remarkable self-control; enthusiastic in the advocacy of any cause which appealed to his heart and brain, but withal courteous and brave enough to acknowledge his errors when convinced that he had been in the wrong.

While at that time his opinions had no special weight and no influence whatever on the trend of events, they are of interest now as reflecting the convictions of those who really were influential in the political arena of both countries and as having been expressed by a man who in after-years became famous, whose name is now a household word in every corner of the globe.

This young man was Samuel F. B. Morse, one of the best of the American painters of the first half of the nineteenth century, but known wherever the electric spark conveys intelligence as the Inventor of the Telegraph.

Born in Charlestown, Massachusetts, and brought up in a New England hotbed of Federalism, he had gone to England in 1811 thoroughly convinced that the Federalists were the true patriots, and that the administration at Washington under President Madison was all wrong. It did not take him long, however, after his arrival in England, to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

make up his mind that he, in common with other New-Englanders, had been in error, and he warmly espoused the cause of the administration and pleaded with his father, who remained a Federalist through the war, to look at things from a broader point of view.

His father, a Congregational clergyman of lofty character, and most of the friends of the young man begged him to leave politics alone and devote himself to his art, fearing for his safety in the enemy's country; but he could not resist the temptation to write many pages, which now have a singular interest, and he seems to have conducted himself otherwise with discretion, for he was in no way molested during his stay in England.

I shall give, with but little or no comment, only such extracts from his letters as have a direct bearing on the events leading up to the war and on the war itself.

The first is from a letter written to a friend in New York on September 17, 1811, and shows him still a good Federalist:

"The accounts lately received from America look rather gloomy; they are thought here to wear a more threatening aspect than they have heretofore done. From my own observation and opportunity of hearing the opinion of the people generally they are extremely desirous of an amicable adjustment of differences, and seem as much opposed to the idea of war as the *better part* of the American people."

The next three extracts are from letters to his parents:

"*November 25th, 1811.*—Distresses are increasing in this country, and disturbances, riots, and so forth, have commenced, as you will see by the papers which accompany this. They are considered very alarming."

"*December 20th, 1811.*—This country appears to me to be in a very bad state. I judge from the increasing disturbances at Nottingham, and more especially from the shocking murders lately committed in this city. A few mornings since was published an account of the murder of a family consisting of four persons, and this moment there is another account of the murder of one consisting of three persons, making the twelfth murder committed in that part of the city within three months, and not one of the murderers as yet has been discovered, although a reward of more than £700, or near $4,000, has been offered for the discovery. The inhabitants are very much alarmed, and hereafter I shall

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sleep with pistols at the head of my bed, although there is little to apprehend in this part of the city; still, as I find many of my acquaintances adopting that plan, I choose rather to be on the safe side and join with them."

"*January 30th, 1812.*—In my next I shall give you some account of politics here and as it respects America. The Federalists are certainly wrong in very many things."

Again writing to his friend in New York on March 15, 1812, he says:

"With respect to politics I know very little, my time being occupied on much pleasanter subjects; I, however, can answer your question whether party spirit is conducted with such virulence here as in America. It is by no means the case; for, although it is in some few instances very violent, still, for the most part, their debates are conducted with great coolness.

"As to the Prince Regent, you have perhaps heard how unpopular he has made himself. He has disappointed the expectations of very many. Among the most unpopular of his measures may be placed the retention of the Orders in Council, which orders, notwithstanding the declaration of Mr. Perceval [the Prime Minister] and others in the ministry to the contrary, are fast, very fast, reducing this country to ruin.

"It is the opinion of some of the best politicians in this country that should the United States either persist in the Non-intercourse Law or declare war this country would be reduced to the lowest extremity. Bankruptcies are daily increasing and petitions from all parts of the kingdom praying for the repeal of the Orders in Council have been presented to the Prince, but he has declined hearing any of them."

Orders in Council were issued by the Sovereign with the advice of the Privy Council in periods of emergency, trusting to their future ratification by Parliament. In this case, while promulgated as a retaliatory measure against Bonaparte's Continental System, they bore heavily upon the commerce of the United States.

The next letters were written to his parents.

"*April 21st, 1812.*—With respect to politics, they appear gloomy on both sides. Since I have been here I have a more favorable opinion of the measures of our Government than I had in America. This country has injured us more than the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Federal papers wish to believe. The Orders in Council are in full operation, and the commercial departments of the papers are filled with names of American vessels *detained* or captured under those orders, while licenses are granted every day to carry on *that trade* direct from this country to France, for which our vessels are seized. This is a fact too well known in this country to be denied and occasions a great outcry against the ministry. You may depend on it England has injured us sorely and our Non-intercourse is a just retaliation for those wrongs.

"Perhaps you will believe what is said in some of the Federal papers, that that measure has no effect on this country. You may be assured the effects are great and severe; I am myself an eye-witness to the effects. The country is in a state of rebellion from literal starvation; accounts are daily received, which grow more and more alarming, from the great manufacturing towns; troops are in motion all over the country, and but last week measures were adopted by Parliament to prevent this metropolis from rising in rebellion by ordering troops to be stationed round the city to be ready at a moment's warning. This I call an alarming period; everybody thinks so and Mr. Perceval himself is frightened and a committee is appointed to take into consideration the Orders in Council.

"Now when you consider that I came to this country prejudiced against our Government and its measures, and that I can have no bad motive in telling you these facts, you will not think hard of me when I say that I hope our Non-intercourse Law will be enforced with all its rigor, as I firmly believe it is the only way to bring this country to terms, and that if persisted in, will certainly bring them to terms. I know it must make some misery at home, but it will be followed by a corresponding happiness after it.

"Some of you at home will call me a Democrat, but facts are stubborn things and I can't deny the truth of what I see every day before my eyes. A man, to judge properly of his country, must, like judging of a picture, view it at a distance.

"In the papers you will probably see before this reaches you the declaration of the Prince Regent, in which he promises the repeal of the Orders in Council as soon as Bonaparte shall repeal the Berlin and Milan decrees *expressly and unconditionally*. Recollect the word *unconditionally*. Those

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

decrees in this way will never be repealed, so that it is but an artifice with the Prince to gain popularity, *which he very much wants.*"

"*May 12th, 1812.*—I write in great haste just to inform you of a dreadful event which happened here last evening and rumors of which will probably reach you before this. Not to keep you in suspense, it is no less than the *assassination of Mr. Perceval,* the Prime Minister of Great Britain. As he was entering the House of Commons last evening a little past five o'clock he was shot directly through the heart by a man from behind the door. He staggered forward and fell and expired in about ten minutes.

"This mention of this shocking affair is but to remove any doubts you might have of the fact. I heard of it last evening about three hours after it was perpetrated, but could not believe it until the particulars were related in the morning papers and *my own eyes* confirmed it. I have just returned from the House of Commons. There was an immense crowd assembled and very riotous. In the hall was written in large letters, '*Peace, or the head of the Regent.*'

"This country is in a very alarming state, and there is no doubt but great quantities of blood will be spilled before it is restored to order. Even while I am writing a party of Life Guards is patrolling the streets. London must soon be the scene of dreadful events.

"Last night I had an opportunity of studying the public mind; it was at the theater; the play was 'Venice Preserved; or, The Plot Discovered.' If you will take the trouble just to read the first act you will see what relation it has to the present state of affairs. When Pierre says to Jaffier, '*Canst thou kill a Senator?*' there were three cheers; and so through the whole. Whenever anything was said concerning conspiracy and in favor of it the audience applauded, and when anything was said against it they hissed. When Pierre asked the conspirators if *Brutus was not a good man* the audience were in a great uproar, applauding so as to prevent for some minutes the progress of the performance. This, I think, shows the public mind to be in great agitation.

"The play of 'Venice Preserved' is not a moral play, and I should not ask you to read any part of it if I could better explain to you the feelings of the public. You must not feel anxious respecting me; I can take care of myself;

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

for, although London will probably be the scene of much bloodshed, I hope I shall have prudence enough to keep clear from danger. If I follow my pursuits without meddling with the affairs of others I shall remain unmolested. So don't feel anxious."

In a letter to his brothers of May 17, 1812, after describing in more detail the assassination, he says:

"The assassin, Bellingham, was immediately taken into custody. He was tried on Friday and condemned to be executed to-morrow morning (Monday, 18th). I shall go to the place to see the concourse of people, for to see him executed I know I could not bear, but the crowd will be immense and you must expect to hear of many lives lost. I should not be surprised if an attempt was made to rescue him. The people are very riotous and this country is in a very troubled state. I will leave a place at the end of this to finish to-morrow after his execution and will then tell you what happened at it. . . . Monday morning, 18th. I went this morning to the execution. A very violent rain prevented so great a crowd as was expected. A few minutes before eight o'clock Bellingham ascended the scaffold. He was very genteelly dressed; he bowed to the crowd, who cried out, 'God bless you!' repeatedly. I saw him draw the cap over his face and shake hands with the clergyman. I stayed no longer, but immediately turned my back and was returning home. I had taken but a few steps before the clock struck eight, and on turning back I saw the crowd beginning to disperse. I have felt the effects of this sight all day and shall probably not get over it for weeks. It was a dreadful sight. There were no accidents."

During all these troubled times Morse was diligently pursuing his studies under Washington Allston, but he again and again, in his long letters to his parents, reverts to matters political, although urged by them not to do so as they cannot agree with him.

"*May 25th, 1812.*—The price of provisions in this country at the present time is enormous; it requires the greatest economy to live in it. The poor are greatly distressed for bread, which is growing dearer and dearer every day. I don't know what will be the consequence if our embargo continues much longer; it distresses the people here six times as much as it does you in America.

"Since Mr. Perceval's assassination there has been no

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

administration; they are hard put to it to form a new one. It is generally thought and universally wished that the first measure of the new administration will remove the Orders in Council. If so peace will be restored and America, I think, should not make peace with this country on any other terms.

"From the late papers from America I find that the aspect of affairs looks more gloomy than ever, and that the prospect of war is more and more certain. If war should break out I should try and get to France, for, although I might obtain permission to stay in this country, I should suffer so much and be obliged to hear so much against my native country that I am sure I should retaliate upon them. My friends here shall all be consulted, however, before I take such a step."

"*June 16th.*—The administration is at length formed and, to the great sorrow of everybody, the old ministers are re-elected. The Orders in Council are the subject of debate at the House of Commons this evening. It is an important crisis, though there is scarcely any hope of their repeal. If they are not, I sincerely hope that America will declare war.

"What Lord Castlereagh said at a public meeting a few days ago ought to be known in America. Respecting the Orders in Council, when some one said, unless they were repealed war with America must be the consequence, he replied that *if the people would but support the ministry in those measures for a short time America would be compelled to submit, for she was not able to go to war.* But I say, and so does every American here who sees how things are going with this country, that, should America but declare war, before hostilities commenced Great Britain would sue for peace on any terms. Great Britain is jealous of us and would trample on us if she could, and I feel ashamed when I see her supported through everything by some of the Federal editors. I wish they could be here a few months and they would be ashamed of themselves. They are injuring their country, for it is *their* violence that induces this Government to persist in their measures by holding out hope that the parties will change and that then they can compel America to do anything. If America loses in this contest and softens her measures toward this country she never need expect to hold up her head again.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"You mustn't blame me for being free on this subject or think I have turned Democrat; I am not of the sentiments I was in America, for I have come to the knowledge of too many truths since I have been here to be any longer of those partial feelings toward this country. I am of no party, but an American, and as such I feel for my country, and am mortified to find so much paper, ink, and breath thrown away for nothing, or, rather, worse than nothing, in supporting the pride of party. If you could be at this distance and see how they appear here you would throw off all party feelings and be neither Democrat nor Federalist, but an American. . . . I write these sentiments the more freely as this letter goes by Mr. Hurd, and of course cannot be in any danger of being intercepted. I should not dare to write this through the post-office."

On June 18, 1812, Congress formally declared war. On the 23d, and before this declaration was received in England, the English Government withdrew the odious Orders in Council, but it was too late now to restore peace, although earnest efforts were made to that end.

"*August 6th, 1812.*—Our political affairs, it seems, have come to a crisis, which I sincerely hope will turn to the advantage of America; it certainly will not to this country. War is an evil which no man ought to think lightly of, but if it ever was just it now is. The English acknowledge it, and what can be more convincing proof than the confession of an enemy?

"I was sorry to hear of the riotous proceedings in Boston. If they knew what an injury they were doing their country, in the opinion of foreign nations, they certainly would refrain from them. I assert (because I have proof) that the Federalists (as they call themselves) in the Northern States have done more injury to their country, by their violent opposition measures, than even a French alliance could. Their proceedings are copied into the English papers, read before Parliament and circulated through the country; and what do they say of them? Do they say the Federalists are patriots and are firm in asserting the rights of their country? No, they call them *cowards*, a *base set,* say they are *traitors to their country,* and ought to be hanged like traitors. These things I have heard and read, and therefore must believe them.

"I wish I could have a talk with you, papa. I am sure I

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

could convince you that neither Federalists nor Democrats were Americans, that war with this country is just, and that the present administration of our country has acted with perfect justice in all their proceedings against this country.

"You will, perhaps, wonder at my writing in this strain and may think some persons have put these sentiments into my head, but I assure you they have not, for it would have been as easy for a Democrat to convince a Federalist in America as for me to be changed when I first came. I only wish you and all those who are warm Federalists could come and stay in London a month or two. If their party enthusiasm was not in that time a little cooled I would engage to forfeit my right hand. To observe the contempt with which America is spoken of, and the epithets of *a nation of cheats, sprung from convicts, pusillanimous, cowardly,* and such like; these, I think, are sufficient to make any true American's blood boil. These are not used by individuals only, but on the floor of the House of Commons.

"The good effects of our declaration of war begin to be perceived already; the tone of their public prints here is a little softer and more submissive. Not one has called in question the justice of the declaration of war; all say, 'We are in the wrong and we shall do well to get out of it as soon as possible.' I have had conversations with strangers who have not known I was an American; they put on long faces and say 'We are a ruined nation; America has been too lightly treated by our Government. Unless America will retract after the receipt of our revocation of those foolish Orders in Council, I do not see a single hope for us.' I always acquiesce.

"I could tell you volumes, but I have not time and it would, perhaps, be impolitic in the present state of affairs. But I only wish that among the infatuated party men I may not find my father, and I hope that he will be neutral, rather than oppose the war measure. For if he will believe a son who loves him and his country (more) the longer and farther he is from them this war will re-establish that character for honor and spirit which our country has lost through the proceedings of Federalists."

This strong appeal had no effect on the opinions of the father and friends at home, and the early disasters to the American arms on land only served to confirm them in their opposition to the war and to the Madison administration.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

When this information, coupled with entreaties and almost commands to leave politics alone and devote himself solely to his art, were conveyed to the young man he answers still more vigorously on November 1, 1812:

"Mr. Plummer, of Boston, has just called on me and informs me he is going home in a day or two. By him I send this in answer to four which I have received from you lately. The last was of October 2d, *via* Halifax, accompanying your sermon on Fast Day. The letter gave me great pleasure, but I must confess that the sentiments in the sermon appeared very *strange* to me, knowing what I, as well as every American here does, respecting the causes of the present war. I am sorry that Federalists make so much opposition to it when every one here, Englishmen as well as Americans, not only know that the war is just on our part, but confess it. The only persons *in the world* who assert the contrary are the Federal party in America. A proof of this is that no English publication, to my knowledge, has dared to justify this Government or accuse ours of injustice in declaring war. On the contrary, they throw all the blame on the administration here and say the Americans could not, in *justice* or *honor*, have done otherwise. What can be a clearer proof than the acknowledgment of an enemy as to this fact. *I* do not merely assert this; every American here knows it.

"The Federalists generally, as a party, I believe, mean well toward their country, and if they knew the facts would certainly join heart and hand in this war. They are too much blinded by the zeal of party spirit and too much led away by wilful misstatements in the violent party papers to act coolly and weigh matters before they decide. Can they say this Government has not injured us when the Orders in Council were such a flagrant proof of it, by virtue of which they debarred us from trade with France and her dependencies, under pretense that we supplied them with articles of war, while they granted, by means of *licenses,* that same trade with France to their own merchantmen; and not only that, but cloth was made here for the express purpose of exporting to France for the clothing of French soldiers? This is a fact brought before Parliament, so it cannot be denied. This circumstance alone is a sufficient cause for war or we cease to be an independent nation.

"A great noise appears to be made in America respecting an apprehended alliance with France. It is a bugbear

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

conjured up by the Federalists, and the inflammatory pieces in the Federal papers have been copied into the English till they almost begin to think there is a foundation for it. I have often blushed for my countrymen on reading some of those violent party essays, and to see how men, for the sake of party, will justify, or rather attempt to justify, this Government through all their base and unwarrantable proceedings. I would ask, because England is at war with France, is it not possible to chastise England for injustice toward us without uniting ourselves with France? Must England treat us worse than her own subjects? Shall she dictate laws to us, and shall we obey for fear of having it said by a few selfish, interested men, engaged mostly in commercial pursuits, that we are uniting with the great tyrant of Europe to destroy the only remaining spot of liberty in the Old World? The object of France is to annihilate this country, that of America to obtain redress from her. Can we not obtain redress without annihilating this country? Great Britain would be very glad to come to our terms long before she was in danger of annihilation.

"You ask in your sermon, 'How can a Christian pray for success against the only Christian nation besides ourselves?' I answer, When the administration of this Government act as becomes Christians toward us and 'do to others as they would be done unto,' then it will be time for a Christian to ask that question; but while they act in direct contradiction to this divine precept, while they do to others what they would *on no consideration* suffer to be done to them, they deserve no consideration as a Christian nation. The few Christians among them should not screen them from punishment, nor justify them in that overbearing spirit which they uniformly manifest toward every nation with whom they deal.

"The question, I think, might be asked with great propriety if it was the object of our war to pull down the Christian religion. No one will dare to say this is the object. If the majority of this country are unprincipled and are uninfluenced by the laws of justice in their dealings with other nations, and by their unjust measures they provoke a country to war, is that war leveled at the Christian religion? The case, I believe, is plain.

"I could write a volume in favor of this war to show the good effects which will result from it, but I shall only

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

relate the visible effects of it on this country of which I am an eye and ear witness.

"1. It has raised our country from the degradation it has long laid under in the opinion of Englishmen. Before the declaration of war America was spoken of with the utmost contempt; the papers teemed with abuse and insinuations against her courage. We were called cowards; sprung from a race of convicts; we were proverbial for a weak, inefficient race of beings; our navy they would sneer at as (to use their own expression) below the Chinese. We were called savages, dishonest in our dealings, and, in short, every epithet of opprobrium was exhausted upon us.

"The moment war was declared by us it seemed to come like an electric shock; all was silent in the papers for some weeks with respect to us. What! thought they, is this the cowardly, weak, inefficient race of men we have so often sneered at? They began a little to recover from the shock; some began to say, 'We never thought they would have declared war; it is a sad business; we have provoked them too far.' When they saw the President's proclamation every man read it and was dumb, or else, with eyes turned up and a deep sigh, exclaimed in a woful accent, 'Tis too true.' No comments have been made on it in any English paper that I have met with or an attempt made to refute a single charge.

"After a short time spent in this manner they began to resume their taunts, and most particularly against our navy. 'Poh!' said they, 'we shall soon see their frigates in our ports; we'll show them a little English thunder and lightning.' In the midst of these exultations came the news of the capture of the *Guerrière*. If ever a shock on the community was distinctly visible it was in this instance; it would have made a subject for a Hogarth to have seen the woful faces the day the news reached London.

"'Can it be true? What! Americans fight? This Chinese navy take an English frigate? No, it cannot be true.' It was then announced officially, and since that time what has been the tone of the English journals? Why, 'the Americans are like ourselves; they inherit the same spirit as Englishmen; they have acted like brave fellows; Captain Hull is a brave man; has behaved like a brave enemy; never was it known in the naval annals of England that a British frigate ever before struck to an American.' Are not these extorted words of respect?

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

" 'Tis the character of Englishmen to be haughty, proud, and overbearing. If this conduct meets with no resistance their treatment becomes more imperious, and the more submissive and conciliating is the object of their imperiousness the more tyrannical are they toward it. This has been their uniform treatment of us and this character pervades all ranks of society, whether in public or private life.

" The only way to please John Bull is to give him a good beating, and such is the singularity of his character that the more you beat him the greater is his respect for you and the more he will esteem you.

" 2. Another good effect of the war, I think, will be to convince ourselves that we ought to have a navy and from every consideration I think this will now be the case.

" We have seen that we have the courage, skill, and power to combat with the boasted *King of the Ocean,* and what power may we not infer we shall have from this superiority? We can then, and not till then, chastise France for her insolence toward us, the Danes, the Tripolitans and Algerines, and, in fact, every nation which can now, from our want of a navy, insult us and commit depredations on our commerce with impunity.

" England will feel it to her interest to be at peace with us, and will, no doubt, be glad to conciliate us, and what may not be expected from the coalition of two Christian powers united by all the ties of blood, congeniality of disposition, and equal courage and skill?

" 3. May it not be a means of uniting the two great contending parties in America? This is certainly a great desideratum, for until we have peace at home we can never expect to be powerful abroad. As it is in the human system, when the heart is diseased the extremities lose their capacity to perform their offices and become weak, so it is with the body politic of a country. If at home they are torn and disturbed by internecine quarrels and dissensions they are incapacitated to do anything efficient abroad. And here let me observe on the newspapers of our country, the corrupt fountains of more corrupt information. 'Tis these which keep alive the coals of dissension among us. Until these are reformed, until the editors of each party cease to irritate and inflame each other by continually overreaching each other in extravagant misrepresentation, and endeavoring, in fact, to outlie their opponents, until the sources of political

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

information become purer—in short, until there is a *third party* formed on the real principles of patriotism, I fear our country will long want a government of sufficient force either to demand obedience at home or command respect abroad.

"After all that I have now said you may perhaps call me a Democrat and say that coming to England has changed my sentiments. If you think from what has gone before and what is to come after that I deserve that name, then I must be content to bear it. My ear shall always be open to truth and my heart to conviction. If I see England abusing us and the Federalists bearing her out in it, when she dare not do it herself, so far I am not a Federalist. And when I see France injuring us and the Democrats endeavoring to hush it up, or to justify her or deny the charge, so far I am not a Democrat.

"The fact is I am of neither party; I have been in England long enough to see that the Federalists are not in the right, and I see Democratic papers from America which, by their gross libels on this country and their violent French spirit, show me they are wrong.

"As for the present war, for reasons which I have given you, I think it a just one and that it will be productive of good effects. As for its tending to destroy this country, I do not believe it and I am far from wishing it. On the contrary, England, next to America, is the country for which I would pray day and night that it might be prospered over all other nations. She is a country which I love with all her faults, and no Englishman would be more sorry to see her sink before any power on earth, for I well know that, were she to fall, not only Christianity, but liberty itself, would fall with her. But that she may be made to feel the injustice of her measures toward us I do sincerely hope, and that she may even be brought to the very verge of destruction unless she gives up the principles on which she laid her Orders in Council.

"England is a proud nation, and much of that pride must be sacrificed if she intends to hold up her head much longer among the nations of the earth.

"Your letters tell me not to meddle at all with politics, but attend wholly to my art. How is it possible for me to remain an unconcerned spectator of events which are happening every day so important to the interests of my coun-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

try? My nature must be changed before I can see my countrymen led away by errors which are ruining their country, while I sit by and calmly see them go on and not even make an attempt to set them right. My motive in thus freely writing to you is to let you into the truth and prevent myself the mortification of seeing my relations involved in errors which are doing so much injury to our country. What I write comes from the heart. I feel the importance of this subject and I have long been waiting for an opportunity to write my opinions fully upon it. I have too much prudence to write such sentiments by post, and, unless I had so excellent an opportunity, I should have waited till I could see you. I give this letter into Mr. Plummer's hands and he is to give it into yours.

"If after all I have now written you still think this war is unjust and think it worth the trouble in order to ascertain the truth, I wish papa would take a trip across the Atlantic, and if he is not convinced of the truth of what I have written in less than two months I will agree to support myself all the time I am in England after this date and never be a farthing's more expense to you."

This is rather a remarkable letter to have been written by a young man of twenty-one. He shows himself, in the light of future events, to have been a keen observer and a true prophet, for the results of the war which he predicted were realized:

1. America did thereby gain the increased respect of the European powers.

2. The increase in efficiency of the American navy may be said to date from the War of 1812.

3. The contending parties in America were united for a long time as a result of the war.

The Federalist party achieved such unenviable notoriety because of its unpatriotic stand in this war that it became virtually extinct in the year 1816, when the electoral votes of only three States—Massachusetts, Connecticut, and Delaware—were cast for the Federalist candidate, Rufus King, of New York; and in 1825 the name Federalist disappears from history and a new party appears, as predicted by Morse, the Whig, while the old party previously known as the Republican or Democratic-Republican soon took the name of Democratic.

EDWARD L. MORSE.

[TO BE CONCLUDED]

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE HISTORICAL ASPECT OF HOME RULE

BY P. J. LENNOX

THE English conquest of Ireland, begun in 1169, formally acknowledged by many of the native chieftains in 1171-1172, and continued under the Plantagenet, Tudor, and Stuart dynasties, was productive of many evil results. Foremost among these was the setting up of two hostile races side by side in one small country. For centuries the English settlers were practically confined to a narrow strip of territory on the east of the island, called the Pale, but in virtue of grants from the English kings they frequently asserted rights to the soil in other districts, and this assertion, necessarily made by force of arms, led to obstinate resistance on the part of the original owners and to constant warfare, reprisals, and bloodshed.

It would have been a part of statesmanship to reconcile the discordant and conflicting elements and by equal laws fairly administered to weld conquerors and conquered into one solid and united nation. Many opportunities arose in the course of time for the carrying out of such a scheme, and the fact that the native Irish frequently petitioned to have English law extended to them would have facilitated a gradual fusion of races and interests. But by a crass stupidity unparalleled in history the English colonists were narrow-minded enough to oppose so wise and statesmanlike a policy, and were always sufficiently influential to prevent its adoption. The enactments that were actually made, such as the Statute of Kilkenny in 1367, had for object, in the words of Sir John Davies, "to create a perpetual separation and enmity between the English and the Irish, pretending, no doubt, that the English in the end should root out the Irish; which the English not being able to do did cause a perpetual war between the two nations."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In the lapse of ages, however, causes beyond the power of laws to render inoperative were at work to bring about a coalescence and a sentiment of common nationhood. The absorbent power of the Irish race was so great that many of the English settlers became in time, through intercourse, intermarriage, fosterage, and gossipred, more Irish than the Irish themselves—*Hibernis ipsis Hiberniores.* Almost from the beginning we find kindly neighborly feelings springing up here and there between colonist and native—feelings which received many an unpleasant jar, but which tended continually to be renewed. Were it not for the introduction of sectarian animosity at the time of the Reformation, and the consequent arousing of those fierce and fiery passions which the *odium theologicum* seems so well calculated to inspire, it is probable that a united Ireland would centuries ago have been evolved; but sectarianism, accentuating racial differences, maintained a cleavage which even to this day has not been wholly bridged.

One point around which common feelings of nationhood would in the long run have almost certainly converged in a unitel Ireland was an Irish parliament, however much of a misnomer the adjective may in reality be when applied to that legislative body as we know it from its history. A distinguishing characteristic of the pioneer English colonists is that wherever they have settled they have, as a rule, brought with them the traditions and set up the form of parliamentary—that is, of representative and deliberative—government. It was so in the North-American colonies; it has been so in Canada, in Australia, in New Zealand; it is so now in South Africa; and Ireland was no exception.

The exact date of the first colonial parliament held in Ireland has not been ascertained. Matthew Paris, indeed, explicitly states that Henry II. held a parliament at Lismore in 1171; but if we remember the conditions then prevalent we shall be inclined to the opinion that if such an assembly was held it was more in the nature of a council than of a parliament. It has been further claimed that Henry, on his return to England in 1172, sent over a document entitled *Modus tenendi parliamentum,* but this statement, too, has been doubted, and the researches of such writers on archæological topics as Coke, Prynne, Selden, Molyneux, and Ware leave it an open question whether the *Modus* belongs to the reign of Henry II. or to the reign

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of Edward III. But that a rudimentary parliament is traceable to a period soon after the Anglo-Norman invasion seems to be fairly well established. Its first shape was probably that of a more or less formal gathering of persons of position; but we have record that in 1295 the elective element was introduced by the admission of knights of the shire to represent the counties, and from that date the assembly took the name and character and discharged the functions of a parliament. To the knights of the shire burgesses were added in 1310. Thereafter we have frequent records of the meetings of parliament.

Of the constitution of the earlier Irish parliaments we have no precise information. How the Kilkenny parliament of 1367, to which reference has already been made, was composed we do not know, but it seems to have been largely attended. A parliament held in 1374 had only 20 members in the House of Commons and during the later Middle Ages the number of members in the Lower House did not much exceed 60. Elizabeth's first Irish parliament, held in 1560, had a roll-call of 98 in the House of Commons, but the tendency was upward, for we find 126 in 1585. By a wholesale creation of new boroughs James I. in 1613 increased the number to 232, and by 1639, in the reign of Charles I., this number had been still further increased to 274. After the revolution of 1688-1689 the House of Commons had 300 members and at that figure it remained until the dissolution of the Irish parliament in 1800. In the upper chamber the temporal peers were at first outnumbered by the bishops and mitered abbots. After the Reformation the Irish Protestant bishops became and for long remained the controlling power in the Irish House of Lords. The lay lords, however, continued to increase, while from the nature of the case the number of bishops remained stationary: in 1681 there were 141 peers, in 1781 there were 202, of whom a constant quantity of 22 were bishops or spiritual peers. It seems, however, to be well established that the bishops exercised a power and influence altogether disproportionate to their mere number.

It must be understood that for hundreds of years the Irish parliament represented only the territory known as the Pale: it was not until 1613 that the whole of the territory of Ireland was represented.

Another feature of the Irish parliament that needs to be

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

emphasized is that from the year 1536, in the reign of Henry VIII., it tended to be sectarian in character, and for almost the last hundred years of its existence was narrowly and even bitterly sectarian. In 1691 the English parliament enacted that only those who took the Oath of Supremacy and signed the Declaration against Transubstantiation could have seats in the Irish parliament. This move, willingly acquiesced in by the latter body, effectually barred the few Catholic members of both Houses who presented themselves at the opening of the session of the Irish parliament in October, 1692, for when the Oath and Declaration were tendered to them they of course refused both and were thereupon peremptorily excluded. But not Catholics alone were thus treated. In 1704 the Test Act was adopted by the Irish parliament. The effect of this was to exclude from membership all Protestant dissenters, and especially the Presbyterians of the north of Ireland, Scottish for the most part, for no loyal member of the Presbyterian Church could take the obnoxious test. Finally, in 1727, by enactment of the Irish parliament, Catholics were deprived of the parliamentary franchise, so that not only could they not be themselves members of Parliament, but they had even no voice in the selection of representatives. It was not until 1780 that the Test Act, which excluded the Presbyterians from Parliament, was repealed. The disabilities as to membership were never removed from the Catholics, and it was only in 1793 that the parliamentary franchise was restored to them. This is not the place to speak of the infamous penal code devised against Catholics from 1695 to 1745. Suffice it to say that, in the words of Edmund Burke, it was "as well fitted for the oppression, impoverishment, and degradation of a feeble people, and the debasement in them of human nature itself, as ever proceeded from the perverted ingenuity of man."

A body so constituted and so inclined is correctly enough described by Lecky as resembling rather an Irish Church Synod than an Irish National Parliament; but it contained at least the foundations of representative government, and the tolerant acts of its very latest years leave scarcely a doubt as to the inference that, with the spread of enlightenment, it would have eventually become broadly national, had its development not been prevented by the abrupt termination of its existence.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The powers possessed by the Irish parliament have been the subject of considerable controversy, in which many able writers have engaged without leaving us much the wiser. Hallam's opinion that English-made statutes were binding in Ireland for two centuries after the English occupation may possibly be correct; but the more generally received theory is based on Bolton's contention that there is no record for four hundred years to show that such statutes were valid in Ireland, unless they were afterward adopted by the Irish parliament, or unless they were merely declaratory of English common law. At later periods we have abundant evidence that the Irish parliament both considered itself independent and acted independently. Thus we find that in 1408 the Irish parliament declared English statutes to be of no force in Ireland "unless they were allowed and published in this Kingdom of Ireland." During the Wars of the Roses the bulk of the Anglo-Irish nobles and the Irish parliament were distinctly Yorkist in their proclivities, and when Richard, Duke of York, after his repulse at Ludlow in 1459, was attainted by the English Lancastrian parliament at Coventry he returned to Dublin, where as viceroy of Ireland he had been very popular. Here, by his authority as viceroy, he summoned a parliament, which decreed that the Irish parliament was independent of that of England, that no laws enacted in England could be enforced or were binding in Ireland except such as were freely accepted by the Irish parliament, and that no writs ran in Ireland except those passed under the Great Seal of Ireland. A separate coinage was established and for a brief period Ireland was practically a separate kingdom. Anglo-Ireland remained loyal to the Yorkist cause even after it had gone down in final and utter defeat at Bosworth in 1485, and accordingly gave an enthusiastic support to Lambert Simnel, the first of those Yorkist pretenders who laid claim to the crown of the Tudor Lancastrian Henry VII., and went to the extreme length of crowning him as king on May 24, 1487. Edward IV., as the new but bogus sovereign was called, issued writs for a parliament and caused penalties to be enacted against the Butlers and the few other Anglo-Irish who had not espoused his cause. Some support was also given to the second and more dangerous pretender, Perkin Warbeck, when he in turn landed in Ireland.

Too much independence had been shown by Parliament

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and people, and Henry, with that subtlety which distinguished him, determined to render as innocuous as possible at least the parliament which had troubled him and his Lancastrian predecessor so sorely. In 1494 he sent over Sir Edward Poynings, an Englishman, as Lord Deputy. By him was held at Drogheda the parliament which, submitting to the influence and overawed by the presence of the English viceroy, performed a most astounding act of self-effacement and passed, in 1495, the famous Poynings' Law, the effect of which was to deprive the Irish parliament of all initiative and to make it absolutely dependent on England. It could not meet without a license under the Great Seal of England; all the acts intended to be passed should be first submitted to and approved by the Viceroy and Irish Privy Council and by them submitted for approval to the King and Privy Council of England; and all laws lately made in England should be valid in Ireland.

The proviso last mentioned proves that in theory as well as in practice the Irish parliament had been previously independent; and even after it had, as it seemed, been effectually muzzled by Poynings' Law, there were not wanting proofs that some semblance of self-assertion was still left. Thus the laws passed in England in the reign of Henry VIII. denying the Pope's spiritual supremacy were re-enacted by the Irish parliament and were not considered binding in Ireland until that had been done. Again, the parliament held in 1692 openly flouted the express wishes of King William III. by refusing to ratify the articles of the Treaty of Limerick, and in the same session declined to make a certain money grant on the high constitutional ground that the money bill had not originated with itself. Thirty years later when, without previous consultation with the Irish viceroy, privy council, or parliament, the Wolverhampton ironmonger, William Wood, was granted an English patent for the coinage of £108,000 worth of halfpennies and farthings for circulation in Ireland, the Irish parliament registered a vigorous protest. The point here made is that such a protest was entered; it would probably have availed but little as a practical preventive, for the coins were beginning to trickle in, had not Dean Swift intervened and by the merciless satire and logic of the *Drapier Letters* caused the patent to be recalled.

But these were only fitful flashes. The normal attitude

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of the Irish parliament was that of acquiescence in English-made measures. For example, only one voice, that of William Molyneux, was raised in the Irish parliament against the adoption of the English Act of 1698, which destroyed the Irish woolen industry, and when Molyneux published as a protest against the system his well-known work, *The Case of Ireland being Bound by Acts of Parliament in England Stated,* his book was declared by the English House of Commons to be a dangerous publication and had the distinction of being condemned to be burned by the common hangman.

Here we see plainly a disposition, on the part of the English Parliament, to assert the right to legislate for Ireland; nor was this an isolated case. Such an assertion underlies at least three other English Acts—namely, (1) that prohibiting the exportation of Irish cattle to England (1665); (2) that prescribing the Oath of Supremacy and the Declaration against Transubstantiation for members of the Irish parliament (1691); and (3) the Act of Resumption (1700), which declared void King William III.'s grants of land in Ireland and appropriated those lands to the public revenue. The climax was reached, and the last shreds of independence left to the Irish parliament were taken away, when, in 1719, the British Parliament passed the Declaratory Act, known as The Sixth of George I., which laid down in theory and settled by practice the principle that Ireland was "dependent on the Crown of England and that the King, with the advice of the Peers and Commons [of Great Britain], in Parliament assembled, had full power to make laws to bind the people of Ireland, and that the House of Lords of Ireland had no jurisdiction to reverse any judgment made in any of the courts."

It was to free the Irish parliament from those restrictions and to make it an independent body that Grattan started his reform agitation in the closing quarter of the eighteenth century. He was materially aided in his exertions by outside world movements of the most momentous character. The revolt of the North American colonies in 1775 and the adhesion of France (1778) and of Spain (1779) to their cause had placed England in a position of extreme difficulty and even of danger. Ireland, stripped of troops needed elsewhere, lay exposed as an easy prey to foreign invasion. That this was no chimerical fear was proved when

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Paul Jones in the *Ranger,* of eighteen guns, sailed into Carrickfergus Bay in April, 1778, and captured the *Drake* of twenty guns stationed there for the protection of his Britannic Majesty's subjects. The same intrepid mariner appeared the following year with a ship of the line and three frigates, and, though he did not attempt a descent on the Irish coast, his presence in the vicinity inspired new terror. The foe from without was rendered more dreadful by threatened national bankruptcy within, for the embargo on exports necessitated by the war had ruined Ireland's commercial prosperity. To make confusion worse confounded the Catholic population of the south was believed to be disaffected and to have leanings toward France. Amid these surroundings the Irish Volunteers sprang into existence. By the middle of June, 1779, they had reached the number of 4,000, by September they had increased to 40,000, and by the autumn of 1780 they were estimated to be between 80,000 and 100,000 strong. Backed by this citizen army, Grattan, in the Irish House of Commons, moved an amendment to the address (1779), declaring that it was by a free export that the nation was to be saved from impending ruin, and his motion was unanimously adopted. The British Parliament at first did nothing in connection with this expression of opinion, but ultimately under strong pressure yielded, and in 1780 granted Ireland the right to trade with the East and the West, with America and the Levant. The Nonconformists also by a special act of the Irish parliament were relieved of their long-standing grievance of the Test.

The Volunteers next began to agitate for an independent Irish parliament. At a convention held at Dungannon in February, 1782, their delegates denounced Poynings' Law and the Sixth of George I. With this strong force of opinion and armed men behind him, Grattan reintroduced for the last time (April 16, 1782) his celebrated Declaration of Independence which on two recent occasions had been defeated. Its tenor was that "no power on earth but the King, Lords, and Commons of Ireland is competent to make laws for Ireland." It was a great historic occasion. The Volunteers in their gorgeous uniforms lined the streets. Floor and gallery of the old house in College Green were crowded. The members were all excitement. The rafters rang with the impassioned eloquence of the orator as he pleaded the cause of Ireland a nation. The populace massed

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in the streets outside took up and reverberated the cheers which greeted every sentence within. Grattan's peroration, hackneyed though it has become by quotation, was a fitting climax to his splendid speech. He said:

"I have spoken so often on the subject of your liberty that I have nothing to add, and have only to admire by what Heaven-directed steps you have proceeded until the whole faculty of the nation is braced up to the act of her own deliverance. I found Ireland on her knees. I watched over her with an eternal solicitude. I have traced her progress from injuries to arms and from arms to liberty. Spirit of Swift: spirit of Molyneux, your genius has prevailed. Ireland is now a nation. In that new character I hail her: and bowing to her august presence I say, *Esto Perpetua.*"

The Declaration of Independence was unanimously voted; it was accepted by the British Parliament within a month and a day and the whole Irish demand was unconditionally conceded.

The constitution thus secured did not last: when closely scrutinized it is doubtful if it had in itself the elements of permanence. There were two fatal bars to its success. The parliament, unreformed, still continued to represent only the non-Catholic element of the country, thus leaving four-fifths of the people without a voice in its election or proceedings. Various attempts at parliamentary reform were made, but not until 1793 was the parliamentary vote given to Catholics, and even then they remained ineligible for actual membership of the assembly. Much had been accomplished toward toning down sectarian animosities, but they were very far indeed from being rooted out. The second flaw was that bills passed by the Irish parliament became statutes only when they had passed the Great Seal of England, and that seal could not be affixed by the King without the advice and consent of his English Councillors. It would thus appear that, much lauded as Grattan's constitutional success has been, and from many points of view deserves to be, his Irish parliament was neither wholly representative nor wholly free.

It has been the fashion to represent the first part of the period that followed the independence of the Irish parliament as a sort of golden age; but in reality many disturbing elements were at work. The debates on Pitt's Commercial Propositions — statesmanlike as these propositions appear to us now—revealed much jealousy of Ireland's prosperity on the part of English commercial centers. The French

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Revolution soon came to reawaken to vigorous life those dormant ideas of liberty and republicanism which had been brought into existence by the Revolution in America and had been fostered by the Volunteers. Side by side with some agricultural and commercial prosperity there was grave political discontent. Sectarianism was again rampant. And always there was the land question, around which were arrayed in hostile camps the Peep o' Day Boys and the Defenders in the north, while in the other provinces it caused a recrudescence of Whiteboyism. The Society of United Irishmen, which sought in league with France to cut the Irish connection with England, grew up and for a time flourished. The peasantry in several counties, goaded to desperation by racial hatred, religious persecution, and unequal land laws, broke into fierce but hopeless rebellion in 1798.

All these things paved the way for the passage of the Union. The legislative union of the two countries was no new idea. It was envisaged for a long time. It had actually been brought to pass by Cromwell and the Long Parliament, and during the Protectorate thirty members from Ireland sat in the English House of Commons. The restoration of Charles II. to the throne of his father also restored a parliament to Ireland, but many thinkers in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries—men like Sir William Petty, William Molyneux, Adam Smith, and Montesquieu—were found to advocate a legislative union of the two countries. The Irish parliament itself had prayed for such a union in 1703 and 1707. The course of events toward the end of the eighteenth century convinced Pitt and Castlereagh that the dual system of government was, as Lord Rosebery puts it, "a vulture gnawing at the vitals of the Empire," and they determined to bring it to an end.

Much eloquent vituperation has been directed against the methods employed to induce the Irish parliament to vote itself out of existence; and in truth it was, as Lord Cornwallis phrased it, dirty work. The two great features that make the Union wear a particularly black and sinister aspect are (1) that it was not submitted as an issue to the electorate of Ireland and (2) that it was carried by bribery and corruption on the most colossal scale.

The Union Bill was adopted by the Irish parliament in July, 1800; it had already passed the English parliament; it received the royal assent on August 2d; and it became

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

operative on January 1, 1801. It provided that the kingdoms of Great Britain and Ireland were to be henceforth one; that twenty-eight temporal peers elected for life by the whole Irish peerage, and four spiritual peers taken by rotation of sessions, should represent Ireland in the British House of Lords; that there should be one hundred representatives of Ireland in the British House of Commons; that the Irish Established Church should be continued forever and united with the Established Church of England; that all members should take an oath that no foreign power had, or ought to have, any pre-eminence, ecclesiastical or spiritual, and that certain principal doctrines of the Catholic Church were "idolatrous and superstitious"; that Ireland was to contribute two-seventeenths to the general expenditure of the United Kingdom for twenty years, at the end of which period a new arrangement was to be made; that the public debt of Ireland—which had been only £4,000,000 in 1797, but in 1800 was £17,000,000—was to remain a separate charge on the revenue of Ireland till the debts of the two countries should be in the proportion of two to fifteen and their respective circumstances should admit of uniform taxation; and that the courts of justice were to remain in the same condition, there being a final appeal to the House of Lords.

Almost immediately after the passage of the Union, agitation began for its repeal. Those who at first wished to have it repealed belonged to the party of ascendency, for they began to feel the want of the loaves and fishes, the spoils of office, that had come their way under the old régime. This was the position until O'Connell, having won Catholic Emancipation in 1829, turned his attention to the repeal agitation. This action on his part at first damped the ardor of the old party of ascendency and finally—such was still the force of sectarianism—made them stanch supporters of the Union. O'Connell's agitation reached enormous dimensions, but it was foredoomed to failure, and he died in 1847, broken in spirit, with his purpose unfulfilled, and his great organization was scattered to the winds.

The period from 1847 to 1870 is in many respects one of the gloomiest in the annals of Ireland. It produced a famine (1847-1849) and two abortive insurrections (1848 and 1867). It produced evictions on a colossal scale and a consequent emigration, which, combined with the famine, re-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

duced the population by over 3,000,000. It produced also in the fifties a set of political knaves and tricksters whose shameless self-seeking and betrayal of principle for place and pelf disgusted the people with parliamentary methods. Such questions as engaged the public mind had reference mainly to the tenure of land, to education, and to the affairs of the Catholic and Established churches—important subjects in themselves, which engrossed attention almost to the exclusion of everything else. Hence during those twenty-three years, except for an occasional voice crying in the wilderness, scarcely any one spoke on the burning question which from 1834 onward, and especially during the heyday of O'Connell in the forties, had occupied the minds of men—namely, the repeal of the Union.

The subject was not dead, however, but sleeping, and it was destined to a gradual but effective awakening. Rightly or wrongly, ever-increasing numbers of Irish people were becoming convinced that many of the ills from which Ireland was suffering were preventable and that they were in great part due to the absence of a native and sympathetic legislature. Hence there arose a new movement which had for object not simple repeal, as originally advocated by O'Connell, but the establishment of an Irish parliament with full control over domestic affairs, leaving purely imperial affairs to the imperial parliament. The leader was Isaac Butt, the son of a Protestant clergyman of the north of Ireland. Butt had been an Orange Tory and as such an old opponent of O'Connell, but the logic of events had brought him round to a change of view. His supporters were drawn from Catholic and non-Catholic ranks alike, and so were his opponents, and thus the movement had from the outset a non-sectarian character. The objects aimed at were crystallized in the two words "Home Rule," a phrase invented by a professor of Trinity College, Dublin, which, being short, handy, and concise, had vitality in it and has endured down to this day. The new movement, which had been brought into existence in 1870 by the Home Government Association and had been kept going in a very determined manner for over three years, was formally promulgated on broad lines at a national conference held at the Rotunda in Dublin on November 18, 1873.

The cause advocated seemed a hopeless one in the beginning, for, despite the great preponderance of sentiment

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in Ireland for Home Rule, motions in its favor were voted down by overwhelming majorities in the imperial parliament. The first of these divisions showed 53 Irish votes for, 37 against; 6 British votes for, 421 against; and the unequal contest went on with little variation in the yearly results until Butt's death in 1879.

In the mean time there had entered Parliament a young Irish representative who was destined to be the means of lifting the cause of Home Rule out of the slough of despond and advancing it, as it was never advanced before, into the region of practical politics. At the age of twenty-nine Charles Stewart Parnell was elected on the Home Rule ticket as member for Meath. Of mixed English, Irish, and American ancestry, he showed more of the phlegm of the Saxon and more of the practical nature of the American than he did of those characteristics which are usually looked upon as distinctively Irish. In 1877 he became prominent in a policy of "obstruction," the essence of which, in its ultimate development, was that Irish members, departing from their former practice, were to take an active interest in British and imperial as well as in Irish affairs, and by debating them in and out of season waste parliamentary time. This policy, rendered possible by the then existing forms and procedure of the House of Commons and carried out in most exasperating fashion by Parnell and Biggar and five or six of their earlier associates, was resented beyond measure in England, but was hailed with the most enthusiastic exultation by the bulk of the people of Ireland. One of the results that flowed from it was that it effectually opened the eyes of British statesmen to the fact that the imperial parliament was unable, for want of time, to deal satisfactorily with local as well as with broad imperial issues.

Parnell, having thus made his mark and secured popularity, was in 1880, by a narrow majority, elected chairman of the Irish Parliamentary Party, over whose destinies he presided for eleven fateful years. He became in 1885 master of a solid parliamentary legion of 86 men, sitting, whatever British party was in power, in eternal opposition. An independent body of 86, counting 172 on a division, is a potent factor in an assembly of 670, which is mainly divided into two great opposing parties and in which in the last analysis nothing counts but votes. Parnell's aim had been to obtain the balance of power between the two great Eng-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

lish parties. He had succeeded so well that after the general election of November-December, 1885, the numbers in the House of Commons stood thus: Liberals, 333; Conservatives, 251; Nationalists, 86; majority of Liberals over Conservatives, 82; majority of Conservatives and Nationalists over Liberals, 4. Under such circumstances "the completion of Irish reforms," as a radical English newspaper of the day put it, was "no longer a matter of benevolent choice, but of stern necessity."

Accordingly on April 8, 1886, Gladstone, in his third premiership, introduced the Government of Ireland Bill, whose essence was that it conceded the principle of a separate parliament for Ireland. He was not able, however, to carry all his party with him and the bill was defeated by a majority of 30—341 to 311—on June 8, 1886, and the decision was confirmed on a dissolution of parliament and an appeal to the electorate. A second Home Rule Bill for Ireland was introduced by Gladstone in his fourth premiership on February 13, 1893, and, after a long debate extending to September 1st, passed its third reading or final stage in the House of Commons by a small majority, but was incontinently rejected on September 9th by the House of Lords by the contemptuous vote of 419 to 41.

Since then no Home Rule Bill was introduced until the April of the present year, but the agitation has been continuous and has riveted international public attention on the question in a most remarkable degree. Parnell fell from power in 1890-1891, and the great party, which he had fused into a homogeneous whole and made into an unparalleled fighting political machine, was rent asunder for a time and all Ireland was straightway divided into warring camps. But such division was disastrous, and Parnell's death in 1891 having paved the way for a reunion, a reconciliation was at length effected, and John Redmond was chosen chairman of the united Nationalists. A very different type of man from Parnell, he has yet proved himself a capable chairman and he has led his party and his country to within sight of the goal. He has had some trouble with the Nationalists and not all of them acknowledge his leadership. He is, however, at the head of a compact body of Parliamentarians, some of whom are distinguished for great ability, and even those Nationalists who do not recognize his leadership are in favor of Home Rule. One of the main

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

objects of himself and his party has been to educate the British democracy up to the point of seeing the fairness of the Home Rule proposition and of realizing what it means not only to Ireland, but also to Great Britain, and for that purpose a vigorous propaganda has been in operation for several years. Such success has been achieved that a vast majority of the electors in Wales and Scotland and a sufficient number in England have given their votes to that British party which has Irish Home Rule for a principal plank in its platform. Sympathetic and practical interest for that policy has also been evoked in the United States and in several of the more important British colonial dependencies.

In Ireland itself there is opposed to Home Rule a small, but by no means negligible, minority, whose representatives in the House of Commons number 19 out of 103, and these figures represent fairly accurately the proportion of Unionists to Home Rulers in Ireland. This minority has raised the old sectarian cry, affirming that under an Irish parliament there would be a persecution of non-Catholics; but the supposition is *a priori* baseless, and the facts of public life as conducted in Ireland to-day in no way warrant it. The House of Lords is still probably as firmly opposed to Home Rule as it was when it threw out the Bill of 1893; but owing to the constitutional change adopted in the summer of 1911, it is now possible, under certain conditions, to put any measure through in spite of its opposition and over its protest. The signs are thus favorable for the successful passage either now or later of the Home Rule Bill of 1912.

Home Rule will not bring the millennium to Ireland; but there can scarcely be a doubt that, coming in the train of beneficent legislation on the tenure of land, on labor, and on agricultural, scientific, and university education, it will tend to promote the peace, prosperity, and happiness of the Irish people.

P. J. Lennox.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

AN ELECTORATE OF MEN AND WOMEN

BY FRANCIS H. BLACKWELL

In the year 1848 there was conceived in the United States the embryo of a movement which, naturally evolved by growing democracy, has since made its way into every legislative hall of our country; has more than once convulsed the British House of Parliament, and is to-day engaging the attention of all classes of people throughout the civilized world. The movement, now commonly known as woman suffrage, has brought about the great politico-social question whether the elective franchise should be granted to woman equally with man. The subject, related as it is to the home, the law, the government, industry, and the general welfare of mankind, is of greater importance, it would seem, than it is generally understood to be.

Woman suffrage is gradually spreading all over the world. In some dozen countries, provinces, or States full suffrage obtains. Eleven countries, provinces, or States have granted municipal suffrage. Woman suffrage is in practice in some form in Australia, New Zealand, Norway, Finland, Iceland, Isle of Man, Pitcairn Island, Bosnia, England and Wales, Ireland, Scotland, Sweden, Denmark, Canada, France, Belgium, Russia, India, Austria, and China.

In the United States full suffrage to woman has been in force in Wyoming forty-two years, in Colorado eighteen years, in Utah fifteen years, in Idaho fifteen years. It was adopted in the State of Washington in 1910 and in California in 1911. Oregon and Nevada are almost within the fold; and Wisconsin and Kansas are said to be hanging in the balance. It is estimated that now more than one million women are eligible to vote their choice of President of the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

United States in 1912. Municipal suffrage has been practised in Kansas twenty-four years, tax suffrage in Montana twenty-four years, in Iowa seventeen years, in Louisiana thirteen years, in New York ten years, in Kansas eight years, in Michigan three years. School suffrage prevails in about twenty-nine States.

None of the foreign countries where women are now taking an active part in government can serve as more than a criterion in a careful consideration of this subject from the view-point of an American. Nearly all of these countries are monarchies or dependencies of royalty practising under one or the other of the two usual forms of government. Our Government corresponds to neither of these forms, but is rather an admixture of them. The nation is not merely a league, but is itself a commonwealth as well as a union of commonwealths, for it commands directly the obedience of every citizen and acts immediately upon him through its courts and its executive officers. The States, too, possess authority not delegated by the central government, but older than the nation itself—a power exclusively their own over their every citizen. This system is founded upon a constitution unique in its plan and dissimilar in its workings to that of any other in the world, a system which has worked marvelously well for a heterogeneous race, but probably would not work at all in the countries referred to. Certain peculiar provisions in the United States Constitution will cause the extension of suffrage to have a different effect in the United States than it will have in countries where the central government is not so directly connected with the people.

Before proceeding to observe the result of woman suffrage where it has been tried in the United States, and to consider the effect such an important change may have upon our Government, let us examine some complications which arise as a result of misconception of the meaning and intended use of certain words and phrases found in the Constitution of the United States—*i. e.*, from the words "persons" and "citizens" and the phrase "privileges and immunities" as they are contained in the second section of Article IV. and the first section of the Fourteenth Amendment.

Claims for suffrage as a right based upon the United States Constitution and its amendments are wholly un-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

founded and ought never to be regarded when attempting to view the subject in its true light.

Our Supreme Courts have clearly and definitely settled that neither the Constitution of the United States nor any amendment thereto has prescribed or attempted to confer the right of suffrage upon any one primarily, but that it is and always has been left to the States to determine what classes of the people shall exercise the right to vote.

As early as 1825 the United States Circuit Court of Pennsylvania was called upon to decide what were the privileges and immunities of a *citizen of a State.* The right of a State to disqualify a voter was squarely before the Supreme Court of Maryland in 1865. Seven years later the United States Supreme Court was called upon to consider the privileges and immunities of a *citizen of the United States.* In 1874 a test case was made in the United States Supreme Court to decide whether a woman had the right to vote. In 1884 the United States Supreme Court passed upon the power of the Federal government to protect a voter against State discrimination.

These decisions of our courts have determined that the right to vote is not included primarily in the privileges and immunities of *State citizenship,* but may be when a citizen is within the requirements and qualifications which the State itself has determined; that the right to vote is not among the privileges and immunities of *Federal citizenship;* that a State may disqualify a voter if there is no discrimination within a class; that when a voter is qualified the Federal government will protect him in the exercise of his right.

But many intelligent people, among them prominent lawyers and statesmen, believed Section 1 of the Fourteenth Amendment did entitle women to vote, and recently a young lawyer offered services to the suffragists to prove that under the United States Constitution women have a right to vote.

Perhaps it will be helpful if we consider somewhat in detail the words " person " and " citizen " and the phrase " privileges and immunities." Some opponents of woman suffrage say that women do not vote because they are only members of the social body, not citizens under the Government. This is not the reason women have not been included generally among voters. A woman may be a citizen just as a man may be. The word " person " is inclusive of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

women. A nation or State is a political community composed of people associated together for the promotion of their general welfare. It is necessary in such a society to give a name to the members, to designate by a title the person and the relation of the person to the nation. In republican countries the word "citizen" has been most commonly employed rather than the word "subject," and this title was adopted by nearly all of our States upon their separation from Great Britain and was used in the Articles of Confederation and repeated in the Constitution of the United States. This Constitution was ordained and established by "the people of the United States," and consequently any person who was one of the people of either of these States when the Constitution of the United States was adopted came within the meaning of the word "citizen" as used therein—became *ipso facto* a citizen, a member of the nation created by its adoption. Proof that women were included among such citizens may be found in the fact that from the inception of legislation upon this subject *alien* women could be *made* citizens by *naturalization*. This would not be if it were not understood that *native* women *were citizens* by birth. To admit alien women to citizenship and debar native women would be beyond all reason. Sex has never been an element of citizenship in our country. We use the word "citizen" in its general sense and understand it to include females as well as males, minors as well as adults, those who do not as well as those who do possess the privilege of the elective franchise. Hence the Fourteenth Amendment was not intended to confer citizenship upon women—it was not needed for that purpose; under our practice they were citizens a century before its adoption.

This leads many into difficulty, for, it is urged, if woman is a citizen the right to vote is one of the privileges and immunities of her citizenship which the Fourteenth Amendment expressly guarantees and forbids the State to abridge. This presents again the inquiry whether suffrage is included in the privileges and immunities of citizenship — whether all citizens are necessarily voters. What are the privileges and immunities of the citizens of the several States has more than once, as we have seen, required judicial decision, and our United States Supreme Court itself has fully felt the difficulty of defining and enumerating all of them. The phrase "privileges and immunities," like many of the maxims and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

phrases found in our State and national instruments, is a very old English expression and was used in the Preamble to the Massachusetts Body of Liberties, in the Articles of Con federation, in the Federal Constitution, and the Civil Rights Act. Among the privileges and immunities as commonly understood may be reckoned the right to be protected in life and liberty, to acquire and hold property, to establish family relations, to contract, to choose a lawful occupation, to have access to the courts, and equality in the benefits and burdens of government. It is safe to infer that Congress understood the privileges and immunities of citizens in general to be those rights which it was believed freemen should possess and enjoy—absolute rights and privileges, not privileges derivative and conventional. In a social compact, such as a body politic, certain members are chosen to administer the affairs of the government, are allotted higher duties according to their higher capacities; and certain other members of the whole body are chosen to express the will of the majority of the people. When the Federal Constitution was adopted all the States, excepting Rhode Island and Connecticut, had constitutions of their own. In none of those States were all citizens permitted to vote under their constitution. Each State determined for itself who should have that power. If it had been intended to make all citizens of the United States voters the framers of the Federal Constitution who were familiar with the practice and impressed with the needs of the people would have expressly declared, and not left to implication, so important a change in the condition of citizenship as it then actually existed.

Article IV., Section 2, reads:

"The citizens of each State shall be entitled to all privileges and immunities of citizens in the several States."

In including in the Constitution this provision for privileges and immunities it was intended, as it had been in the Articles of Confederation, to secure intercourse among the people of thirteen colonies which were foreign and strange to each other and to confer a general citizenship with the right to hold property in the several States—to secure the citizens of one State from discrimination on the part of a stranger State into which they might go. It was not the purpose to create any new rights.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Article XIV. of the Amendments, Section 1, reads:

"All persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they reside. No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property without due process of law, nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws."

This article was one of the three reconstruction amendments which grew out of the Civil War and was added primarily for the negro to secure him in the liberty which had been found to be incomplete. The purpose of the first clause was to put at rest the question whether colored persons were to be recognized as citizens, a question which had been considered adversely in the very noted case of Dred Scott *vs.* Sanford. It created no new rights and added nothing to the privileges and immunities existing and practised for a century before its adoption. Its purpose is to guarantee *equality,* not to establish *identity*—it is *protective* rather than *investive.*

Neither is the right to vote inherent in citizenship, as is persistently claimed. We have seen that women are citizens, but the right to vote is not inherent in any citizenship. "Inherent" means permanently united as an element or quality. The right of suffrage is not elementary in citizenship, but is a strictly civil right which a man may never possess or which may become separated from him after it attaches to him. The right to vote is not one of the elements that go to make up citizenship—is not original or inherent; it is conventional and derivative.

When women first made organized demand for the suffrage they entitled it "a right"; and writers and lecturers ever since continue to speak of it as if it were primarily a right of one kind or another. Sometimes it is claimed the elective franchise is based on a right founded upon a consideration of justice, and sometimes it is claimed on the ground that unenfranchised women are deprived of natural, inalienable, and indefeasible rights. There are many species of rights, among which may be mentioned moral, legal, civil, those that are natural and absolute, those that are organic and fundamental, and those that are established by custom. These take the form of passive and active rights. In social

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and political affairs that is right which is consonant to the laws and customs of the country. Let us see what are natural, inalienable, and indefeasible rights. Alice Stone Blackwell, writing in *Objections Answered,* says: "It is hard to define just what a 'natural right' is." "Natural" means that which is fixed by nature and pertains to the constitution of mankind, that which is intrinsic or native rather than acquired or assumed. Natural rights are such as are inherent in birth. Can we say that a man is born with the right to vote? If so, can we deprive a minor of the right and has not a baby the right? Ida Husted Harper has devoted several pages to reprints of expressions of our early statesmen, and arguments to show that these high minds all designated the suffrage as an inalienable right. But they made no such mistake; they were speaking in each instance of the right of *representation,* not the right to *cast a ballot.* The word "inalienable" means something that is incapable of being transferred to another—that is inalienable which one cannot give away or dispose of even if one wishes to; that is indefeasible which one cannot be deprived of without one's consent. These words inalienable and indefeasible properly refer to things already acquired or possessed. If the right to vote is not a natural right it is not an inalienable right. The greater part of our rights are absolute rights; rights not determined by society nor derived from constitutions, but rights much older which were originally protected by the common law. The personal rights commonly enumerated as natural to man and inalienable are "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." The right to vote is not one of these; it is not a right founded upon either natural or positive law nor upon any consideration of custom; it is not such as belongs of right to all citizens and which has at all times been enjoyed by the citizens of all free governments. If the right of suffrage were a natural right it would pertain to every man and woman without regard to sex, age, education, residence, or naturalization, and no sovereignty could dictate, limit, or restrict it. It is manifest that this is not so. The right to vote is a privilege conferred, a privilege rather than a prerogative—always a special, exceptional, and artificial right. Whenever any person of a class brings himself within certain requirements he becomes clothed in the right. The right to vote is no more than one of the integral parts of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the order or system which experience has shown to be necessary to the successful conduct of the business—the government—of the great illimitable society of mankind. It is a right in possession, never otherwise.

Fallacious reasoning, on the one hand, and carping argument or sentiment without reason on the other, only serve as a hindrance to a clear understanding of woman suffrage. Nor can the subject be successfully discussed in rigmarole.

With this in mind, let us consider woman suffrage as we find it in our own country; its result, the effect which universal adoption of it in the United States may have, the expediency or necessity for such a change.

To ascertain first hand what has been the result of full suffrage to woman the writer addressed inquiry two years ago to certain prominent sources in the four of our States in which this so-called revolution has been long tried, sources selected without antecedent knowledge of the parties or their politics. The result was a strong indorsement of the practice. About the same time Julia Ward Howe circulated letters among the clergymen and editors of newspapers in the same States. The replies of the Episcopal clergy were favorable, more than two to one; those of the Baptist ministers seven to one, of the Congregational ministers nearly eight to one, and of the Presbyterians more than eleven to one. The editors, in the ratio of more than eight to one, gave favorable reports.

Space will not here permit of the many assurances that can be offered of the complete success of female suffrage where it has been tried in its fullest, but in the light of experience it would seem unnecessary. The weight of evidence is supplied by the whole people there—they have not withdrawn the suffrage. They not only adhere to and retain it, but they enlarge its scope. As against this preponderance of evidence the pro and con deductions of individual members are of little value. The cause is to be tried on its merits. The writer feels no hesitation in declaring that its favor far outweighs its faults and that it can be worked successfully in our country.

Proceeding on the hypothesis that woman suffrage can work successfully in the United States, let us consider the different species of the elective franchise with reference to the effect the change may have if it becomes universal. The most common form, school suffrage, carries with it no privi-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

lege outside of the domain of education. Beyond this it has no immediate effect. The tax suffrage entitles women not merely to a voice, but to participation by electoral power in the laying of taxes and the direction of the expenditure. This is an important privilege, but does not have direct effect outside of its own sphere. The full suffrage carries the right to vote for all elective officers, national, State, and municipal. Under our Federal Constitution this must include the right in a woman to be the head of the nation, to hold the highest office within the gift of the people upon the same terms as a man may. The right to participate in the ballot for State officers makes the woman voter eligible to be the Governor. And the municipal suffrage entitles the enfranchised woman to fill the most important elective office in the city or town. For Americans would deem it the height of illogical reasoning to grant municipal suffrage to women and not allow a woman to be Mayor—to give women the right to vote at State elections, and consequently the right to vote for members of Congress, yet withhold from them the right to sit in either the State Legislature or in Congress—to give them a vote in the election of the President and yet disqualify a woman from the Presidency of the United States.

The effect of school suffrage is beneficial. Good results of it are acknowledged by opponents of the cause. No ill results may be expected from the tax suffrage. The woman property-owner, like the man, wishes for well-made, well-lighted, clean highways, adequate sewers, good water, efficient police and fire service, and all improvements which tend to enhance property. Women can lend assistance in matters of taxation which would probably be of benefit to all. They have more time to examine into a proposed measure, to investigate circumstances, and disseminate information tending to arrest attention and lead to wise determination of the question by both men and women. The universal adoption of the full suffrage will be far-reaching in its effect. It will, substantially, admit women to hold any elective office from the Surrogate to the President. It may subject women to jury service. And it will greatly increase the electorate. Doubtless no cause for alarm will ever arise from any of these conditions. If a woman is ever President of the United States it will be because some ten million men and women know of special ability possessed by the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

incumbent. Our Constitution will not permit her to pass in by hereditary right; and unless the people want her to be their leader she never can be. As she may be perfectly competent to act as President, in the same measure will she be fit to fill any other elective office. Some inconveniences may arise from the existence of women jurors. Space will not permit full consideration of this condition. A panel of women jurors would be undesirable; a mixed jury may be quite an improvement. Such a change will probably never double the electorate, as some predict. Enlarging it will necessitate readjustment of precinct, ward, and State divisions and other changes, at much cost; but the additional expense will be met many fold by the saving of waste and misappropriation which will result if we produce an intelligent electorate. While it would be best if the electorate could be restricted to men and women on an educational basis or in some way limited within intelligence, this is quite impracticable and we must accept the alternative of an increase in size to obtain quality.

If government by a mixed electorate can work in our country, what reasons can be urged for a change that will affect and probably alter materially "the famous instrument of 1789 which summed up so much of what is best in the laws and customs of an ancient monarchy," as Mr. James Bryce said; under which the minds and temper of the American people have been formed, and the test of which has supplied to them stability and permanence of political arrangement; the noble charter of fundamental law, still rigid in the letter, but docile in the spirit, against which the people lean more and more as time moves and which many are more than ever reluctant to alter—what reasons can be urged for the change? It seems that something more than the restless impatience of a class or the clamor of a temporary majority cries out for a change—that it is now expedient and necessary that the suffrage should be extended to include woman to an active part in the affairs of our Government.

One of the potent factors in a change which seems predestined is the great growth in the industrial development of the world. The irresistible pressure of economic evolution, the marvelous development of industrial vigor, have brought to modern life a complexity far beyond the capacity of individual man. Little by little in the process many

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of the increasing details in the work of life have shifted from the man to the woman, gradually changing her vocation, until these details have become so numerous and the whole so huge that both man and woman are crying out for the great hand of government to take up their burdens. The change from the one-time Jack-of-all-trades to the present-day special-part operative was made step by step. The advent of the machine hastened the movement and opened up and settled a new world. By the change woman has been thrust into industry. No longer is the woman of the home engaged in soap and candle making, in spinning, weaving, sewing, baking, and brewing. All these occupations have yielded to industrial advancement; they have gone from the home to the factory and women perforce have followed. More than this, innumerable occupations unknown to the Colonial dame, many, in fact, lately born, now engage women in employment. Our industrial development has transplaced a large proportion of women from the hearthstone into the market-place, until to-day not alone one, but many members go to and fro from the *ménage* to labor. So the duties of women, as well as those of men, have passed out of the rudimentary, from the simplex to the complex, until woman has by force become a factor in the evolution of mechanical and commercial industry. She has entered the professions—the ministry, medicine, and the law—and has won distinguishment in the sciences and the arts.

The indications are that there are few kinds of work from which the female sex is absolutely debarred either by nature or law or custom. There are about 5,000,000 female breadwinners in the United States above the age of sixteen years. Of the 303 occupations classified in the Twelfth Census women are represented in all but nine. It is surprising to note that they are found among pilots, baggagemen, brakemen, conductors, engineers, firemen, switchmen, yard-men, flag-men, ship carpenters, roofers, blacksmiths, machinists, boiler-makers, charcoal, coke and lime burners, slaters, and well-borers. This is a wonderful transmutation over which neither man nor woman has control.

In this evolution the ballot, which came as an absolute necessity to the husbandman, remained an absolute need of the labor man; indeed, he has been forced to the forum by the cruelties which have characterized industrial progress. If the ballot is a necessity for the protection and the best

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

interests of the working-man—and who will attempt to confute that it is?—can any logical reason be offered for the prediction that the working-woman will escape the same necessity? On the contrary, her need will be twofold. Men in labor ranks have evinced jealous apprehension of women competitors. If the male representatives of unionized labor are to have a part in framing the laws pertaining to labor, it is obvious that they will not extend the power of their vote to protect the enemy in their camp, the co-laborer whom they do not want and with whom they are not yet in sympathy and agreement. Self-interest and self-preservation will prevail over gallantry. Hence the twofold need of the woman at work—to be armed with the electoral power as a fortification against capital force and as an independent protection of her special interests. Women working under the same general economic conditions with men should have the same legal, civic, and moral resources. Having been moved into the field by the natural evolution, justice will award to woman a free competition in business, free enterprise in labor, and equal opportunity in industry.

In the first fifty years of the nineteenth century the population of the United States increased about 18,000,000, in the next thirty years about 27,000,000, and in the last thirty years 43,000,000.

This extraordinary growth and development has carried with it necessary complications which have resulted in the general complexity of modern life, one part of which is unprecedented expansion of government.

The times demand the strong arm of government—the cry is for paternal government. Our people lean more and more upon government, and not alone upon their State government but upon the great national body, upon which they increasingly depend to solve the great problems of the day. Even the vast increase in the business of Statehood is moderate, almost meager, compared with the enormous growth of Federal power—the growing tendency to centralization in our national government. This great ruler is now interesting itself in the eradication of disease and pests, in communication, conservation, manufacture, agriculture, and commerce; it interests itself in babies, in its people of all ages; it tells them how they shall live, what they may do, where they may work, how they may conduct business, how best to be educated; and it turns its searchlight into the dark

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

recesses of corporate and monopolistic corruption, and upon every evil which may threaten harm to its wards.

As the government comes closer to the individual, the vote becomes a greater factor and the responsibility on the elector increases. Thus multiple complications and the expansion of government have attached to a man's vote manifold and complex importance which now requires a change in the manner of expressing public opinion.

Although ours is considered to be government by public opinion, it may be said that we seldom ascertain what is the truly public opinion. Under the present conditions, it seems to be inexpressible and therefore indeterminable. Our political system has become so cumbersome, our balloting so numerous and intricate, that the voter is overwhelmed. The present long-ballot system, the need for the perplexing ready-made ticket, frequent elections, manifold elective offices, innumerable commissions and boards, have thrown upon the voter more duty than his time will permit of performing intelligently. Finally a large percentage of the citizens ignore politics altogether, cultivate a dull sense of responsibility, and sink into individual insignificance, leaving politics and the administration of government to the political specialist, the demagogue, the machine boss, and the clique. This will be seen later when we speak of the "stay-away vote."

In New York City nearly five hundred State, city, and county offices are to be filled every four years by popular vote. In Chicago the number is greater, and in Philadelphia still greater. Even in a small city in Massachusetts the voter is confronted with a ballot-sheet 15 x 16 inches containing some thirteen groups of offices, for which fifty-four men are named, from which eighteen are to be chosen. In addition, he may be asked to decide the question, "Shall an Act passed by the General Court in the year 1910, entitled 'An Act relative to the school committee of the city of . . .' be accepted?" How many citizens will know anything about these fifty-four men; and how many, confronted in the privacy of their booth with unintelligible inquiries, will know the purport of the Act upon which they are to decide? How is the voter competent to say whether his Yes or No will be best for the interest of himself and his fellow-citizens if he does not know the Act? The ballot for an English municipal election is no larger than half the size of our

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ordinary envelope. Usually it contains the names of two candidates for one office, member of council for the ward.

It requires no ingenuity to cast the ballot, as some infer, but it may not be incorrect to say it requires a genius to cast an intelligent vote, and will until we learn to simplify our methods.

Notwithstanding that men have made great sacrifices for the free ballot and that some would still fight in an attempt to prevent its free bestowal, men are singularly deficient and negligent in the performance of the duty which the ballot casts upon them. So prevalent is this that some theorists propose that the privilege of the elective franchise shall carry with it a penal condition to compel its use.

This leads us to consider "the stay-away vote," a prominent feature in the absent public opinion. At the last national election 10,000,000 males of voting age took no part in the election of President. About 150,000 registered voters of Massachusetts cast no ballot for President. There are about 75,000 male legal voters in Massachusetts who do not register to vote. In a population of 670,585 there are only 110,677 male registered voters in Boston, Massachusetts. The city collector recently petitioned the Boston City Council to cancel $1,674,880 poll taxes, to collect which much effort and money had been expended. Out of about 11,000 assessed polls in Newton, Massachusetts, about 3,000 vote at a city election. Here is a striking example of the indifference of the citizens, in which regard Massachusetts is one of the most delinquent States in the Union.

Not only is the voting power—the very foundation of our democratic government—weakened by the citizens' atrophied disuse of it, but it is still further weakened by another element, the ignorant vote.

The revised statutes of the United States require that an alien to be naturalized must speak the English language, must have resided in the United States five years and have made application two years prior to being admitted to citizenship. But the privilege of naturalization and the right to vote are derived from distinct and different sources. The former is exclusively the gift of the Union, the latter exclusively the gift of the State. Hence the State government may permit persons to vote long before the national Government deems them qualified to be its citizens. In the exercise of their power to regulate the elective franchise,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

eleven of our States permit aliens to vote, before they are naturalized, equally with native-born or naturalized citizens. In four of the States aliens who have declared their intention to become United States citizens may vote six months after landing; and there seems to be no definite requirement as to reading or writing.

About 2,000 aliens arrive in America each day. About 10,000,000 of the increase in population of the past ten years are foreigners and 7,000,000 native. Of the 25,000,000 males of voting age in the United States about 3,000,000 are illiterate.

Now the foreigner's vote is undesirable only in so far as it is an ignorant vote. If it is an intelligent vote it is valuable. But the immigrant usually is uneducated, unfamiliar with the foreign language, wholly unacquainted with the new form of government, and not in the slightest conversant with nor able to understand the needs of the country and what will best conserve the interests of the greatest number. They must needs fall an easy prey to the demagogue and the political hector. This is disastrous—it adds a force to corrupt politics which the limited intelligent vote exercised by the native may be insufficient to control or overthrow. Furthermore, our Constitution is so constructed that the ignorant State voter participates in the election of the head of the nation. Each vote of this class corralled by the political agent of the octopus employer to be used for the election of a silver-standard ruler, or for any destructive folly, counts equally against the vote of the intelligent citizen who knows such a choice would be ruinous.

Too much stress cannot be placed upon the importance of intelligence in the electorate to offset the twofold evil of the indifference of native citizens and the injection of ignorant voters. It would be well if the elective franchise could be regulated by civil examination, but it would seem that this is wholly impracticable. As important as it is that educated and virtuous citizenship should be set against sordid, venal, and malevolent politics, it is more important that intelligent, independent thought and expression be offset against the illiterate and dependent ignorance of a large class of voters both native and foreign.

In conclusion let us observe what is taking place and why the question of woman suffrage is compelling such general attention.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The very numerous grants of the school suffrage indicate that the people have come quite generally to deem it meet and advisable that women shall take an active part in the educational branch of government.

The inclusion of women in a vote upon a question of taxation is an admission of them to participation in one of the basal and essential branches of all government; therefore, this latest form of suffrage is a further recognition that women under our present altered and advanced conditions are a component part of the political society.

The example given us by four of the States of our country furnishes clear proof that where suffrage has been extended to include women so that they can take an active part in the complete system of government—in other words, where woman suffrage has been tried in its fullest, the majority of the people consider it a success and an improvement. The irrefragable proof that this is the majority opinion is found in the fact that no attempt is made in any of these States to withdraw the franchise from women and adopt the usual method of government.

Further evidence is offered by the acts of the people of a fifth and a sixth State, neighborhood States so situated as likely to be conversant with the practice in their sister States, in the adoption of an amendment to their constitution admitting women to active participation in the government.

How illogical, then, in the face of present conditions, is the argument that women are not competent to express an opinion in the affairs of government by a vote. To say they are not competent and yet admit them to take part and advise in matters of education, the motive power of our present intellectual development and expansion, the very solar light which reflects the intimate relation between intelligence and democracy. To say they are not competent and yet admit them to participation in the great subject of taxation, one of the main arteries of the body politic, a serious subject in every government. To deem them incompetent in the face of the determined success they have made of their work where their co-operation in all affairs of the government has been long tried and tested.

But some people fear that to admit women to the full elective franchise will upset the social and political poise and revolutionize our government.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

No system of government as it stands is quite the masterpiece of human wisdom. Time was when men considered that the best form of government was a wise and benevolent despotism. Since, however, people have grown to a capacity for self-government experience has shown that the most complete popular government is the best — that form of government in which the citizens have, in addition to their passive rights, active right of participation in the government. We wish to practise the true democracy. We believe in individualism, in the *spirit* of triumphant democracy. But if in our *practice* we place improper restraints or limitations in the way of any class of members, we are looking at our system through the mirage of a false democracy. The existence in a country of an elemental class ruled without voice may be a weak spot in the body politic. Government is instituted for the common good. The value of a constitution may be measured by its fitness to the needs of the people at any given time. If an institution, custom, or practice falls behind progress, the system affected may become a purely arbitrary and artificial form. Do you know that with us misgovernment is continuous and universal, that maladministration prevails? Millions upon millions of dollars are wasted and misapplied annually in cities, States, and nation. Yet we practise under one of the best forms of government.

Now it is probable that nothing will mitigate the vigor of growing government. We are in the midst of a condition, not a theory. Amelioration from some source is necessary. The American man appears to be too much engrossed in the intricate affairs of the modern life to be able to attentively and carefully look after the kaleidoscopic duties now comprised in the political labyrinth. At any rate, he is neglecting to do so. The voters constitute the broad base of the structure of government. The structure has grown in its highest parts, it requires a larger pedestal. It is to be regretted that the needed strength cannot be supplied in quality without increasing quantity. If it cannot there appears to be nothing to do but to broaden the base. It would seem that the time had come when woman must take her place by the side of man and participate in his labor in government as she has in his labor in the home and in industry

FRANCIS H. BLACKWELL.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

REALISM IN FICTION

BY ARTHUR C. BENSON

THERE are periods in the world's history when a great wave of thought and impulse comes rolling in from the unknown deeps. It is common enough to attribute such movements of the world-spirit, whatever it be, to the influence of some personality or group of personalities; but we are learning to perceive that this is not the case, and that though men of prophetic spirit may be the first to recognize and proclaim the new tendency, yet it is only that they are the first to be consciously affected, and that the same impulse is making itself felt, however blindly and dumbly, in all thinking and feeling minds.

The last century has seen the rise of the scientific spirit; and though it is no part of my business here to trace its general manifestations, one can see its effect in our imaginative literature as clearly as in any other department of human life.

The essence of the scientific spirit is to observe, to analyze, to accumulate evidence, to look closer into life, to mistrust generalization, to record, and to represent. This need not necessarily be done with a philosophical motive; it may just manifest itself in an impatience of old conclusions and conventions, in a determination to see everything in a clear light, without hurried inference or traditional prejudice, to make sure of the ground, to neglect nothing, to distort nothing.

This tendency is making itself felt very surely and distinctly in our present-day fiction. The old inclination of the tellers of tales obeying, no doubt, a similar inclination on the part of listeners, was to brush aside all the vulgar, obvious, and commonplace elements of life, to represent character at its highest and most heroic, and at the same time, in order to make the background darker and blacker by way of con-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

trast, to intensify the uglier and more evil elements, that the nobler types of temperament might be more radiantly and emphatically outlined.

That was what romance, developing and broadening out of epic, tried to do. It is not necessary to censure or condemn this tendency in the name of art: as long as the aim is clearly realized and apprehended, it is a perfectly legitimate and natural form of art.

But imaginative writers in these later days have wearied of all that. They have begun to perceive that life itself is far more wonderful and abundant than any arbitrary reconstruction of it; that the interest of life lies in the very fact that we cannot, as the poet says, "remold it nearer to our heart's desire," but that it is an infinitely mysterious and complex thing, which we can only criticize by studying; and that we must not be afraid of looking closely at its baser sides, its failures, its contradictions; because it is in them that the very secret of life lies. The imaginative spirit has grown to perceive that truth is a far more interesting thing than any private fancy, and it has learned, too, that the imaginative faculty can be just as nobly used in selection and firm representation as it was used in discarding and remodeling.

It is this, then, that we call Realism: a determination, not necessarily with any scientific purpose, to present life as it is, and to recognize that so viewed it has a higher sort of beauty in it than any vague imported beauty won by suppression and contempt of what appears to be commonplace.

Now it is first necessary to say that this method, the realistic method, must be a spontaneous and authentic one. It wholly fails of its aim if it is a merely irritable protest against the old sweetness and solemnity. It must include romance and not defy it. It must realize that the world does produce heroic spirits of inspired quality. There is in humanity a deep spring of nobility, which leaps into the air at times of crisis and revolt; and there is also a lofty equanimity, a high and silent patience, which manifests itself, though it sometimes eludes observation, in the dreariest and dullest of surroundings. Realism must frankly recognize this, and must not forbid the heroic subject. It may be as minute as possible, but it need not, therefore, be mean—all that it can do is to abstain from the accumulation of melodramatic elements, from overfortunate coincidences,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

from caricatures of heroism, from absurd elongation and fantastic emphasis; it is, of course, a much more difficult business to indicate heroic qualities subject to all the shadows of circumstance, the unpleasant obstacles, the feeble lapses, the languors and fatigues of life. There must be no *Deus ex machinâ,* no magic weapons which no human armor can withstand, no seven-leagued boots, none of the miraculous apparatus lavished by old romance upon its central figures. Perhaps the worst feature of the old epic was the intolerable complacency of the hero, the way in which he boasted and bragged of his exploits, the self-conscious dramatization of his whole career. The realistic hero need not be forbidden to do great, patient, courageous things, but he must do them unemotionally and naturally, not for the sake of their effect, but because they seem to him the obvious and simple thing to do.

But the main business of the realist will be this, not simply to invent situations in which all his characters will be enabled to display their salient qualities, but to observe the sort of situations which actually do occur in life, and to face the fact that most people are very strangely compounded of excellence and meanness, that the processes of improvement and disintegration are alike slow and gradual, with many an ebb and flow; and that there is in all human life a strange chemical power of assimilation and combination, so that good and evil are alike delicately evoked and fostered and obliterated by human relations and admixtures.

Again, the realist must make it his aim to suppress as far as possible all bias and prejudice: he must not maintain a thesis or take a side: he must not personify his own hopes and fears, his likes and dislikes. He must clearly perceive that the trade or occupation or interests or powers of his characters matter very little, and amount to hardly more than difference of vesture and accent, and that men bring the same characteristics to whatever they do. He must realize that the main interests of mankind do not now reside in combat or even in love-making; that the old romances dealt largely in such things because it is in these regions that the most ardent and eager excitements of humanity are experienced, but that apart from these sublimated moments property, work, health, social intercourse, religion, politics, education, and many other things, thoughtlessly and trivially held to be unromantic and unpoetical, do really

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

make up for crowds of intelligent and vigorous people the solid substance of life quite apart from any idealization or sentimentality.

Indeed, it is of sentiment that the realist must mainly beware, because the great danger of the romancer is sentiment. It is a thing which most people value highly, and none the less because it is more rare than is supposed. Long tracts of life have to be lived without it, and it is a special gift like all other gifts. But just because it has an ineffable sweetness and fragrance, and because it is evoked very emphatically of certain periods and crises of life, there is a great demand for its importation; a writer who can evoke the appropriate sentiment for an occasion is warmly welcomed by people whose desire is greater than their emotion; and so the temptation of the romancer is to load every rift with sentiment, to make persons thrill responsively to every possibility of it. Yet what is the case in real life? Is it not every one's experience to look forward with intense anticipation to the visit of a friend, and then, instead of a luxury of emotion, to find the friend dull or preoccupied, or oneself cold and tongue-tied? One revisits some old and familiar scene, and expects a perfect symphony of memory and haunted echoes; and some dreary fact of life intervenes, some discomfort, the presence of a pert and unsympathetic person, some prosaic anxiety; and the scene is as hollow and meaningless as the painted background of the stage seen in leaden daylight. The pleasure which most of us feel in romance is in the deliberate suppression of intrusive flatness, in the rehabilitation of life on a sublime plane, in the concentration of ideal effects. And if this is the case with the deep and luxurious emotions of life, it is equally so when the romancer is dealing with tragic passions, with vices, with harsh and trenchant faults. How common it is in real life to find the fierce and malevolent person acting with unexpected mildness and generosity! How poignant situations collapse! How unexpectedly reasonable the impatient and aggressive show themselves! In a word, how unexpected life is in its transformations and its developments! How perfectly normal it is for two perfectly incongruous faults to be found side by side in the same person —large generosity with petty meanness; fiery irascibility with maudlin tenderness! The realist has to grasp and express the fact that many people are wholly inconsistent,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and that it is next to impossible to generalize—that, in fact, every individual is unique, not true to sample, not to be depended upon for good or for evil. And one of the subtlest things of all is the strange phenomenon of combination, the magnetic effect which some people have over others, so that in the presence of the magnetist the person affected is wholly, though temporarily, transformed. Any schoolmaster knows that a collection of boys is not a mere sum of individuals, but that there is a sort of chemical influence resulting from juxtaposition which has to be reckoned with as a very potent and vivid force indeed, rousing slumbering qualities and emphasizing inconvenient tastes.

Here, too, is one of the immense difficulties of realistic portraiture of life, that it is lived in the mysterious region we call *the present,* which is gone the moment we are able to recollect it and regard it mentally, and that it resides in that terrible thing called motion, and motion which cannot be arrested; and yet we know that just as the electric current is a totally different thing from the incandescent point at which we see it, through which it flows, at that one fragment of space made visible and tangible, so life is itself a wholly different thing from its manifestation in present deed and word. This is the overwhelming problem for the artist of life, that he has somehow got to convey the impression of the current itself, of the permeating essence which is so vastly different from its perceptible collision and glow. In real life people do not and cannot say what they mean; the emotion is so infinitely larger a thing than any possible expression of it; what can be momentarily felt might take an hour to describe; and yet the essence of the thought is the simultaneous blending of strains felt but not consciously or rationally expressed, which if analyzed lose their quality, as the spectrum loses the quality and effect of the total ray. Emotion is a thing which communicates itself quite independently of speech, by glance, by gesture, and by actual fusion of vital currents too swift for the brain to formulate them. The melodramatist, the romancer is condemned to try to express these literally, to make people say what they leave unsaid, to put into clumsy word what really lies hidden as a glowing and flashing thought.

Now the realist is here in a dilemma. If he describes a scene as it occurs, it is often principally remarkable for the entire suppression of all visible and audible emotion.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

And it is certainly my experience, and I should imagine the experience of every one, in England, at all events, that in tragic scenes and situations where the atmosphere is tense with emotion, the most amazing fact is the incredibly commonplace things which people say and do. In the most tragic scene which I can call to mind the conversation was mainly about the weather; it was an intense relief to every one present that any one should have been sensible enough to introduce the subject. But the realist has got to express the emotion somehow, and to catch, if he can, without lengthy analysis, that extraordinary fusion which comes at moments of intensely vivid emotion of indignation, grief, memory, anguish, regret, mingled at the same time with the most inconsequent and trivial thought and observation. It is the lightning rapidity of thought which is the problem, and the realist has somehow to give the impression of this boiling cauldron of feeling with all its incongruous impediments. The supreme triumph of the art of Mr. Wells is in his wonderful power of rendering a confused and complex frame of mind. Tolstoy again in a less definitely intellectual region has a matchless gift for producing the effect, by characteristic selection, of the aimless reveries of the mind.

But we are most of us very much at the mercy of convention and tradition and association. Our impressions of things as they happen are largely amplified by recollection and inference. We are in the position of the naval captain who objected to a picture of Turner's that there were no port-holes visible in a ship. Turner took him out-of-doors and showed him by ocular demonstration that in a ship at that distance the port-holes were not visible. The fact was that the captain knew they were there; and in representations of life we often demand that things should be depicted which we know to be there, even though in actual fact they are invisible. And that is the difficulty of dealing with books; we have hitherto lived so much with romance, the essence of which is to represent life as it is not, amassing coincidences, emphasizing salient points, exaggerating, suppressing, making people say what they do not say but only dimly think, that we have got to demand a treatment of life which is not actual, and even to believe that it is actual. If realism is to prevail, as I have little doubt it will prevail, we have to be educated out of our convention, we have got to dispense with many convenient symbols and learn a new

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

code of signals. The old emotions have somehow to be expressed and indicated, but it will require far more art to treat them and far more observation to clothe them.

We must never forget, in art, that we are dealing with symbols and not with actual things. When a great draughtsman sets on paper in a few lines, with a bit of chalk, the outline of a beautiful face—those first five lines which, as Ruskin said, do more to present the subject than any of the thousands of strokes made afterward, he is only using a code of signals. A face is not in the least like that, a face has not a black bounding line and a dead white surface; but we have got used by long practice to seeing the thing conceived inside the hard outline; but the outline is not itself beautiful: there is no intrinsic beauty in black lines on white paper; it is the beautiful thought, the beautiful vision in the artist's mind, which is affecting us. The sketch is like the wire which holds the swift electric current, like a track across the void, over which our spirit can go to meet and greet his spirit. He enables us by signals thus used, by hints and whispers, to guess at what he has perceived; we can clothe the outline with the vesture of humanity, tinge the pale space with the hue of pulsing blood, supply the crystalline depth of the wide eye, body forth the wave-like ripple of the curling hair. The effect, then, depends upon three conditions: the perfect visualization of the thought in the artist's brain, the suggestiveness of the line he traces, and the power in ourselves, whatever that be, to reproduce by insight and sympathy the artist's image.

Now the realist and the romancer are alike in this, that they are both trying to make their conception as clear and as suggestive as they can. The end of all art is to produce the idea as swiftly, as clearly, and as economically as it can. So far as the setting of the picture goes—the scene, the background—both are working on the same lines; but while the art of the romancer is directed to what is impressive, trenchant, rich, resonant, while he exaggerates and emphasizes, the art of the realist is directed to recovering, as far as he can, what the perceptive human being does actually retain and observe of a scene. Thus if the romancer is dealing with a tragic episode, he colors all his picture with salient ornament, he works up his details so as to give it all a fateful and stupendous air—he treats his subject, in fact, as a painter of historical pictures treats his subject;

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

he studies accessories, he is careful about the contemporary accuracy of his robes and weapons, he makes his setting gorgeous and elaborate; but the realist will set himself rather to imagine what the human being in a moment of tragic emotion does actually see and observe; and he will, therefore, tend to minimize and hint his detail, and concentrate his powers upon the actual and vivid emotions of the scene. We may observe how in a romance the detail is generally equally distributed all along the line; as the story proceeds, each episode is treated with the same richness and expansiveness, and the setting is as carefully worked out. But what, as a matter of fact, does the reader of a breathless romance actually do? If one takes the trouble to look critically through a romance which one has read with absorbed interest, one infallibly finds that one has a much clearer memory of the initial detail than of the subsequent detail. The later descriptions, if one has been really interested in the emotional progress of the story, will be found to have left but little mark upon the mind; if one has not actually skipped them, one has made one's way through them impatiently, like a man struggling through a copse to the open daylight. And one finds that it is much the same with the rhetoric employed. When, in the later scenes of a romance, hero and heroine speak as elaborately as ever, deal in leisurely metaphors, expand the thought into well-balanced parentheses, one finds that one has scampered through them in one's eagerness to tear the heart out of the scene; one neglects the deftness of the strokes in one's anxiety to arrive at the issue of the game.

The realist works on quite a different method; and one finds in all good realistic books that the accessory detail gets more and more economized toward the end; there is often a lavish use of it at the beginning to assist the mind to form a literal conception of the scene; but this is more and more sparingly employed, while the attention is more and more concentrated on the action, the interplay of emotion, the dramatic vigor of the situation. The more that the mind becomes concentrated on the personalities, the more that the subject takes shape, so much the swifter do the details flash by and leave the mind at leisure to apprehend the central emotion. Everything is discarded which does not bear poignantly and naturally upon the emotion. The truth is that the romancer is giving shape to his own im-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

agination, and luxuriously indulging it, while the realist is thinking all the time how the scene is viewed through the eyes of human beings, who are absorbed in the progress of their own emotions. It is not that one method is better than the other. They are both being pursued instinctively and intentionally, only with different aims. The romancer is taken up with the equable progress of his scene, and he starts with the assumption that he is not presenting life as it enacts itself, but as it might appear to an observer who is more intent upon the pageant than upon the interplay of human qualities. But the realist is in and behind every one of his characters, losing himself in their fears and hopes, their desires and their perplexities; and his aim is not to present something formal, stately, decorous, majestic, but to reflect the breathlessness, the indecision, the swift mental changes, the ebb and flow of the mood. He does not say to himself, "How can this be largely and deliberately represented?" but he is trying to discern the clash of weapons, the unexpected thrust, the agonized parry, the heat and terror of the conflict. He subordinates everything, not to the solemn mood of the actor who says, "How can I give this thought the fullest and most distinct impression?" but to the hurried mood of the man who has to do the best he can, and often does much worse than he could have done if he had but had the time to reflect. Time does not wait for us in life, as it waits for us in romances. We have to play an unrehearsed part, we have to speak and act extempore. The romancer is the man who plans the scene beforehand, and can assign to his antagonist the precise mode of his attack; or he is the man who recalls a scene, and invents the telling repartee, the effective statement, that he might have made if he had not been so bewildered by the onset. But the realist thinks rather of the courage which suddenly plays one false, of the stupefaction caused by the unexpected event, of the sudden flaring up and dying down of impulse, of the way in which a bodily desire instantaneously shatters a philosophical programme, of the incredible dualism of humanity. The pleasure of romance is that it is life highly planned, pleasantly rearranged, deliberately lived; the force of the realist rather lies in the truth of the thing, the overpowering vagueness of emotion, the treacherous slip, the fatuous lapse, the tendency of humanity to be unequal to a situation with due regard to the possibility of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

being strangely and splendidly, on great occasions, surprised by readiness and inventiveness and unanticipated nobility.

The romancer follows reason in his method, the realist follows instinct. And as a matter of fact we most of us actually live by instinct, and find reasons to justify us as soon as we conveniently can.

Then there is another great difficulty which besets realism: The difficulty in dealing with life as it is, is that it so largely consists in long, dreary, subdued, monotonous tracts of vapid talk, unrelieved work, days of drab and sullen texture, infinite repetitions, dull delays. People tell the same stories, say the same things, think the same thoughts, wear the same clothes over and over again. These things gain a cumulative force from their dreadful iteration. There is a passage in one of Keats's letters written when he was on a walking tour with a precise and prosaic friend. Keats describes how every night the friend unpacks his writing-case, gets out his things in a certain order, first the blotting-paper, then the ink, then the paper, and last of all the pen. Keats describes the irritating effect of this, and says that he begs his friend in vain sometimes to get out the pen first. But that is a romantic frame of mind. If one loves life, one ought to be able to see with renewed and perennial delight the same ceremonious order preserved, and to be pleased that the clock strikes the hour so regularly.

The realist has got somehow or other to reproduce the effect of this iteration: he cannot do it by iteration, for then the world itself, as the writer of the Fourth Gospel naïvely says, could not contain the books that should be written. The realist must select as well as the romancer; but he must not select the glowing and sparkling events, he must select the characteristic ones; and he must give the effect of repetition without repeating himself. That is, perhaps, why realism is so late a growth, because writers despaired of producing the effect of length and continuity by brief phrases.

Miss Austen is, perhaps, the supreme exponent of this method. Take the case of Mr. Woodhouse in *Emma*. His biography as extracted from the book would fill a few pages —there is one long conversation, a few short ones, and a few directions about food and health. Yet the picture of the kindly, silly, timid, hospitable hypochondriac stands out with absolute firmness from the record. The thing is to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

set the imagination at work, and to give the reader the power of creating the shadowed background permeated by the thin trickle of Mr. Woodhouse's medical hopes and fears. One never doubts that Mr. Woodhouse is somewhere alive at this moment, if one could but get his address, counter-ordering the carriage, praising the smallness of his eggs, begging that wine may be well qualified with water, happily anticipating his evening gruel, supremely contented in spite of his pitiful limitations.

Miss Austen is, in fact, the first instance in the literature of the century of the realistic method being applied to fiction. It was done quite instinctively, not with any idea of carrying out an artistic creed, but by the genius of a single mind, which saw life so, and found spontaneously and in isolation a perfect expression of the principle. The wonderful thing is that it was done when the air was all full of romance. Scott with his prodigal power was writing great romances, and interspersing them with passages of frank realism; but all the structures of his books were romantic, and his main motives are generally almost epical in character. The realism of Scott is a kind of admirable by-play, an importation into his story of traits and types which he had delightedly observed. Miss Austen has given an admirably concise and modest account of her own methods. She expressed no sort of rebellion against romantic methods. She chose her own method simply because it was the only method she felt capable of using and applying. The result is that all her characters and all her plots are conceived with marvelous delicacy on an actual plane; no figure in her books is ever consciously heroic, and the characters modify and affect each other's action and thought exactly as they do upon the stage of life. The wonder is that, though she had many admirers, she had no imitators. Minds used to romance not only demanded romance in fiction, but probably did not even discern that life was not romantic. And so from its very delicacy and fineness, from the subtle and charming humor which edges all the details with gold, the beautiful perfection of her art and method was overlooked, and the possibilities of such treatment neglected.

But after Miss Austen the waters of romance closed in over the head of realism. George Eliot did indeed attempt a more or less realistic treatment of romantic subjects, notably in *Middlemarch*. But in Mr. Thomas Hardy the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

pendulum swung even farther back into a kind of epical solemnity and magnificence. In the art at last of Mr. George Moore, Mr. Wells, and Mr. Arnold Bennett, to mention but three outstanding figures, the new realism substantially develops, and seems certain to transmute our native fiction.

The realist, in working out his subject, must allow things to appear before their significance appears. He must not, like the writer of romance, give his readers the opportunity of perceiving at once what a hint or an accident is going to develop into, of chuckling in anticipation over results. He must not so much see things as they are, but as they become. There must be in his work a sense of the terror of the thing going on indistinctly at a distance; he must not interpret events too soon; he must never be hurried. The fact must loom up as a crag through mist, vast, imponderable, impalpable; it must not be too tangible or too decipherable; there must be no sense that the author is controlling events, or casting characters into the scales. He must seem to be analyzing, recording; the issue must seem to be as much a surprise to him, when it comes, as it is to the reader; the spectator may be able to see, after the event or the decision, that it was, after all, inevitable; but there must be in it the anxious anticipation of life, the sense of mystery, the inability to predict exactly how the different elements will affect each other when the time comes for them to be fused.

I suppose that it is certain, as we go deeper into psychology, that we shall come to have a far clearer idea of mental and emotional processes; but at present we are on the edge of an unexplored region, and know very little of the chemistry of the soul. Probably we shall come to see that the strange currents of public opinion, the vagaries of individuals, the forces which determine what we think and feel, the great irrational impulses which defy prudence and experience alike, are all the manifestations of a psychic force, which is to the spiritual world what electricity is to the material world. The realist is a scientific observer of that force, and any one who has once really embarked upon that sort of investigation will sicken of the old glib conventional romance, which played with forces as a child plays with bricks, and adjusted them to its trivial sense of triumph and success. In the region which I have described, triumph, success, comfort, prosperity, play a very secondary part. They are there indeed, pleasant and desirable things, sweet

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

as the honeycomb, warm as the sunshine. But it is experience of which we are in search. The romancer writes that the happy pair lived happily ever afterward, and signs his name with a flourish; but the realist looks past the marriage procession, and hears sounds behind the clash of bells. He sees the world pass on its way, strong and dreadful and adorable; but it can be adored no longer like a slim white statue in its alcove at the end of a vista through the trailing trellis roses. It is something larger; more uncouth, more monstrous than that. It moves heavily and solemnly forward, with sighs and groans. It is not satisfied, it is not content; everywhere the horizon is closed by the blank wall of death. It has its times of ease and security, even of ecstasy; but there is always something to come, something ahead that cannot be clearly discerned. The road narrows to a point in the distance, passes over the hill, is lost to view. The strong breaks down, the lover flags, the beloved grows old and sad, the laughing child becomes the dismal man; and the reverse too happens: the calamity enriches, the heedless become wise, the clouds break in blessings, the music comes upon the air. The real failure in life is to become dull, settled, conventional, comfort-loving; the success is to remain vivid, interested, hopeful.

And thus the realist has a great work before him; he can bring into his task all the vital forces and experiences of life; he need not sort and reject, though he must balance and economize. The immense, the portentous difficulty of his work is the delight of it as well, because he is dealing, not as the arithmetician with definite ciphers, but as the geometrician with all kinds of curves and infinities, true not in one precise and limited relation, but in all space and time. But all this has to be subjugated and interpreted by art; and the reason why it is so complex is because it is a sudden unrolling and unfolding of a vast range of subjects, which have all to be analyzed and concentrated into slender books and tiny squares of print. So that the realist is like the visionary in Tennyson who reads the magic book of charms, with the margins scribbled over with the condensed labors of many a solitary student—the book of life. And of that book it is true, as it was of the other magical volume, that—

> None could read the comment but himself
> And none could read the book; not even he.

ARTHUR C. BENSON.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

WHAT IS BEHAISM?

BY JAMES T. BIXBY

One of the recent noteworthy events in the religious and philanthropic world has been the arrival in this country of the head of the Oriental religion which originated in Persia in the middle of the last century. Abbas Effendi or Abdul Beha, as he prefers to be called, is he whom the Behais reverently recognize as their Lord and Master; and he has come from his home in Akka in Syria to make an address upon International Peace at the Mohonk Conference and to dedicate in Chicago a temple to serve as a spiritual home and agency in that city for the disciples resident there.

This mission is very significant religiously. It is a public display of the addition to the list of missionary religions of a new and enterprising faith not restricted to any one nationality, but seeking proselytes from all existing races, countries, and religions. Its aspirations are world-wide and it sets forth remarkable claims to be better adapted to become a universal religion and to be a higher and fuller revelation of spiritual truth than any of its historic predecessors, such as Judaism, Muhammadanism, or Christianity. As an international ambassador of peace, the first one of the acknowledged primates of a considerable Church to exhibit public and conspicuous activity in opposing war, the presence of this head of the Behai faith to co-operate in the establishment of "the Most Great Peace," and the bringing together of all the nations in harmony, under treaty agreements, to submit their differences to the judicial decision of Arbitration Boards is both a notable and a helpful event. Although in China over two thousand years ago the founder of Taouism advocated non-resistance and the abolition of armies, yet in the centuries since then Asiatic hands have ever been quick to draw the sword and Asiatic voices, es-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

pecially in the Muhammadan world, have been vigorous in vindicating the resort to military force. Such allies in the Peace Movement as the Behai community supplies are therefore very valuable.

Although originating less than a century ago, the Behais are believed to number some two million followers in Asia and several thousand adherents in the United States, chiefly residents of New York, Washington, and Chicago.

In the brief personal acquaintance with the head of the new faith, with which I have been honored, Abbas has impressed me as a man of great mental ability, tact, and persuasive power; friendly in disposition, affable in his manners, and amiable and progressive in his spirit. He is wisely putting the emphasis in the Behai community more and more on those great principles of international fellowship and friendly relations between diverse faiths and races that best realize the essence of the Christian spirit. Moreover, he has practically exemplified these principles in his own pacific conduct and charitable activities. The descriptions that visitors to Akka have given of his daily personal benefactions is, indeed, beautiful and impressive. The warm welcome and cordial greetings which he has received here have been most creditable to the breadth and kindliness of American Christianity.

The growing interest in this new religion, the very name of which a few years ago was quite unfamiliar to American ears, makes it interesting to turn back and review its origin and course of development.

Some recent writers and adherents have denied that this new Persian revelation is either a sect, a religion, or has had either ecclesiastical or political entanglements. But in its early stage, when it was known as Babiism, it bred alarming insurrections that were not subdued by the Persian Government for months. Beha'u'llah, after whom Behaism takes its name, was claimed by his followers and by himself to be the Lord of the Visible and the Invisible World and the highest Manifestation of God yet given to the world. The holy scriptures of this faith equal in their bulk and claims to sanctity the Quran, the Bible, and the Zand-Avesta. If any one, in the light of such facts, still doubts that the new Persian faith is properly called a religion and not a mere "movement" let him read that popular Behai hymn the "Tarkib-Band." In the adoring strains of this Persian

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

psalm, Beha is called "The Lord without Compare," "The Creator of Creation and Distributor of Provisions," "The Object of Man's Creation," "Free from Time and Eternity." No Christian bard has ever used more glowing and unqualified epithets in glorifying the Christ than the Behai worshipers have lavished on the Divine Manifestation who dwelt at Akka. Behaism is, therefore, rightly called a religion. Now to understand the source and nature of our own Christian religion there is no light so priceless as that which is supplied by studying at close range the rise and development of a new faith in our own age and among those Oriental peoples, where the Gospel of Christ originated.

Behaism, in its origin, was an outgrowth of Babiism. This preceding faith was a reformed Muhammadanism of a pronounced adventist and theophanic type. It developed from what has been called the Shaykhi School of Shiite Muhammadanism. Seventy years ago a specially intense spiritual unrest pervaded Persia. This was due to the expected return to the earth of the Imam-Mahdi, who a thousand years before had mysteriously disappeared and was now expected to come back and inaugurate a reign of universal blessedness.

It was in this atmosphere of religious expectation that the youth, afterward called the Bab, grew up. His proper name was Mirza Ali Muhammad. He was born in 1820 at Shiraz. He was a self-made business man, but was very devout and upright and found time to attend the lectures of the leader of the Shaykhi School, Seyyid Kazim. When this leader died, Mirza Ali Muhammad assumed the headship.

Although he had not long before been considered illiterate, he now astonished his fellow-members by improvising Arabic poems, which were regarded by them as so eloquent, subtle, and profound that they were regarded as inspired, and he was proclaimed to be the long-expected Bab, or Gateway of Revelation.

A crowd of ardent disciples gathered about him; and in the next year, 1844, the exact completion of the sacred cycle of a thousand years, Mirza Ali Muhammad went to Mecca and proclaimed himself to the throng of pilgrims there as the Forerunner of the Imam-Mahdi.

On returning to Persia the new Gospel was vigorously pushed. The vices, ignorance, and bigotry of the Moslem clergy were unsparingly denounced. A multitude of astonishing miracles were related to the people as having been per-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

formed by the Bab or as having attended his steps—healings, prophecies, transfigurations in celestial glory, and exhibitions of marvelous knowledge. The commotion led to his imprisonment by the authorities. But he was allowed to write and communicate with his disciples, and during his imprisonment he elaborated an entirely new system of theology, morals, sociology, politics, and chronology.

The ardor and credulity of his disciples grew fast. Soon he was proclaimed as much more than the mere Gate of Revelation. Mirza Ali Muhammad was himself the long-expected Imam-Mahdi, "the Center of the Covenant" or "Goal of Revelation," the full manifestation of Allah. It was only from humility and prudence that at first his Divinity had been veiled and he had been content to call himself merely the *Bab,* or Gateway to the complete Divine Manifestation.

The Babis now began to explain away all the outward forms of Moslem religion—prayer, fasting, pilgrimage, and alms-giving—as mere symbols, not things to be carried out practically. The Babis began to put many of these reforms in practice. The tax-collectors were forcibly resisted; the Moslem clergy and officials began to repress the Babis with cruelty and force; the Babis retorted by assassinating the persecutors. Great insurrections broke out. The Babis resisted the Government troops with amazing heroism; and when arrested, tortured, and executed they endured martyrdom with the most pathetic fortitude. The heresy spread more and more. So the stupid Prime Minister thought to stamp it out for good and all by putting the Bab himself to death. Then a most dramatic thing happened, almost one of the great miracles of history. The Bab, after having endured the worst indignities and cruelties with Christ-like patience and fidelity, was at length hung up by ropes against the brick wall of the military barracks to be shot to death.

The second volley was fired at the Bab. When the smoke rolled away, wonder of wonders! The Bab had disappeared. The people cried, "He has gone up to heaven." The officers were beside themselves. Was it a trick or a miracle? At length they found him alive and calm in the guard-room, serenely writing on the wall a stanza breathing a spirit of dauntless courage. The soldiers ran a sword into him and then hung him up again on the wall, and by another volley ended his mortal life.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In 1852 three Babis tried to assassinate the Shah. Because of this, hundreds of innocent fellow-believers were condemned to death, which they met most nobly. The cruelties and tortures which the Babis suffered at this time are only paralleled by those inflicted on the early Christians in Nero's time; and the heroism and martyr faith and fortitude of the Babis were as lustrous as those of any Christian martyr.

Of course, none of these persecutions put an end to Babiism. It only grew more rapidly in secret. Long before the death of the Bab he had appointed his successor. This was Mirza Yahya, a young Persian noble—a man of great piety, courtesy, and scholarship, a fine poet and devout mystic. Under the title of Subh-i-Ezel—*i. e.*, "the Morning of Eternity," he was for some fourteen years the undisputed head of the Babi church. But Subh-i-Ezel was unequal to the situation. More a scholar and a devotee than a man of affairs as Subh-i-Ezel was, the interests of the Babi church suffered.

Now there was a half-brother of Subh-i-Ezel, whose name was Mirza Huseyn Ali. He was thirteen years older than his brother and was just the man for administering the affairs of the new church. Huseyn Ali was, indeed, not one of the "Letters of the Living"; but as the Primate's brother he might be the power behind the throne. A man of resolute spirit and great executive ability, he took up the administrative reins which the dreamy Subh-i-Ezel did not care to guide. But after having managed affairs for some fourteen years in Subh-i-Ezel's name, Huseyn Ali concluded that he might as well have the official position also.

The Bab himself originally had only claimed to be the "Gate," or Forerunner of the full Divine Manifestation. Now all the Babis agreed that the providential sign of "Him whom God should manifest" to complete the Babi religion and reveal the Perfect Divinity was "the improvisation of Arabic poetry." This was no difficult miracle; and so in 1866 or 1867, at Adrianople, whither the Babi leaders had removed, Mirza Huseyn Ali, the half-brother, improvised a quantity of religious verse and revealed sundry signs in fervid Arabic and Persian rhapsodies whereby he claimed to be himself the full "Point of Revelation" or "Center of the Covenant" to whom all the verses and prophecies of the Bab pointed. He took the name henceforth of Beha'u'llah—*i. e.*, "The Glory of God,"

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and at other times called himself "The Supreme Perfection." The Bab was no longer to be looked upon as a veritable impersonation of the Divine, but as a mere precursor of "the Manifestation of God" which appeared in the person of Beha. Subh-i-Ezel, who for fourteen years at least had been regarded as the authoritative head of the Babi church, was branded as the "First Letter of Denial" unless he yielded to his elder brother. It was true that in 1861 or 1862 Beha had in his own writings (the Ikan) admitted the spiritual headship of Subh-i-Ezel and declared that "he [Beha] never sought supremacy over any one." Now Beha proclaimed himself "The Lord of the Divine Attributes," "The Point," or "Providential Goal of Revelation."

In the Sura-i-Heykel, or Discourse of the Divine Temple, Beha'u'llah relates how "an angel appeared and, addressing the heavenly hosts," declared Beha to be "the Beauty of God in their midst" and "God's authority among them"; "the mystery of God and His command"; "one hair of whom is more precious in God's sight than all things in heaven and earth"; that he has been appointed "a temple" to be "the source of life amid the new Creation."

This proclamation rent the Babi church asunder by the most bitter of schisms. The majority of the Babis, especially the younger, accepted Beha'u'llah as their master. The older leaders, who had been personal friends of the Bab and had exposed their lives in his behalf, stood stanchly by his nominee, the gentle visionary Subh-i-Ezel. But one by one they dropped away, not a few of them becoming victims of the unscrupulous violence of their rivals.

The author of the Hasht-Bihisht alleges that sixteen of the followers of Ezel were thus removed; and Subh-i-Ezel, in his statement to Captain Young, charges that altogether about twenty of his party were killed by the partisans of Beha. It is even charged in the Hasht-Bihisht that Beha-'u'llah was personally concerned in an attempt to poison his half-brother with a dish of poisoned rice. Beha and his daughter, Behaiah Khanum, in published accounts, agree that there was such an attempt at poisoning, but charge that it was Subh-i-Ezel who tried to poison Beha.

The lamentable thing in Beha's conduct at this time is, as his own writings show, that Beha regarded the assassinations of Subh-i-Ezel's followers, two of whom were among

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the original Apostles, not with abhorrence, but as Divine judgments upon his foes. There is, however, no evidence that the assassins acted under orders from Beha.

At any rate, if the end justifies the means, the means were approved by the victory achieved. The assassinations were a success. The weak Subh-i-Ezel was deserted. The great majority joined Beha's party. The Turkish Government, to put a stop to the wrangling and disorders, exiled Subh-i-Ezel to Famagusta in Cyprus, where he lived many years in obscurity; and Beha was sent to Akka in Syria, where he peacefully passed away in 1892. Before his death he had worked a momentous revolution in Babiism. As soon as he was established in his authority he began to exercise the privilege which all the Babis recognized as belonging to the final "Point of Revelation"—*viz.*, to abrogate, change, develop, and supersede the earlier revelations. He discouraged the visionary speculations of his followers, made the religion more moral and less metaphysical, and abolished many useless and impractical regulations; especially he did everything he could to conciliate the temporal authorities, even the Shah of Persia, whom the older Babis were accustomed to curse as the Nero of their faith. Believing that the new faith could grow better by assimilating the elements already estranged from the orthodox Mussulman Church, he strove steadily to diminish the ratio of Muhammadan thought in it and to seek a better understanding with the Christians, Jews, and Zoroastrians. In short, he tried to make Behaism henceforth a *universal* system suitable to all mankind. The older Babi scriptures and epistles, with their magniloquent rhapsodies, foggy mysticism, and wild visions of the return of the Imam-Mahdi and the millennial marvels of the new age, he allowed to fall into innocuous desuetude. The earlier history of the origin and rise of the Bab and his church was written over by Beha's adherents, in the book, *A Traveler's Narrative,* in an entirely new vein. The Bab was represented as a mere forerunner of Beha; Subh-i-Ezel was described as a coward and fugitive who went about in disguises; his earlier friends, Hazrat-i-Kuddus and the famous woman Apostle "Consolation of Eyes," were depreciated; and Beha'u'llah and his Neo-Babi doctrines were glorified, and every expression of detestation of the Shah which might interfere with Beha's new policy of conciliating the Persian Government was eliminated.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The effort thus radically to metamorphose the whole record of Babist history fortunately failed through the fact that many of the early documents had previously passed into European hands; but the effort to establish pacific relations with the Persian Government proved successful, and for forty years the Babis have been free from public persecution. By a secret propaganda they have greatly diffused their doctrines. Some writers even claim that there are now several millions of followers of the new religion.

Of Beha's life at Akka, where he remained over twenty years, there is little to relate. He remained most of the time in deep seclusion in a villa outside the city, supported by the Turkish Government and his presence carefully guarded from the approach of irreverent or curious people by his devoted followers.

Most of his time was spent in composing the sacred writings which now form the authoritative scriptures of the Behai faith. These comprise codes of laws, hygienic, ceremonial, and moral regulations, formulas for prayers to be said three times a day, explanations of prophecy and theological problems, and multitudes of tablets or religious epistles to believers. The best known, perhaps, are the famous epistles to the leading European monarchs containing his noted prophecies of the downfall of Abdul-Asiz and Napoleon III. Finding the Christians quite sympathetic, Beha now gave special attention to securing converts among them. In the year 1892, at the age of seventy-five, however, his supreme divinity failed any longer to protect Beha against the attacks of fleshly maladies, and, like any other mortal, he paid the usual debt to Nature.

Beha was succeeded in the office of authoritative head of the Behai church by his oldest son, Abbas, the "Greatest Branch." In this difficult position he has conducted himself with dignity, discretion, and breadth of mind. Soon after Beha's death a bitter quarrel broke out. Two half-brothers of Abbas and the aged secretary of Beha made serious charges against Abdul-Beha, and the adherents of Abdul-Beha made equally bitter charges in rebuttal. In the end Abbas and his party had a majority of the believers, and Abbas remains the acknowledged head of the church. The rebellious brothers have submitted to the authority of Abbas.

Just what is the spiritual rank or claim of Abbas is somewhat doubtful. Many of the faithful call him a "return"

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

or reincarnation of Christ, and apply to Abbas the Old Testament prophecies as to the Messiah and claim that they are fulfilled in him. The eminent Behai writer, Abul Fazl, whose book on the Behai proofs has been approved by Abbas, states that Beha conferred upon Abbas the titles of "The Mystery of God," "The Greatest Branch of God," and "The Center of the Covenant" (or cause of God). He is recognized by all Behais as the authoritative expounder of the Divine Book, the Kitab-i-Akdas, and the source and origin of the commands and prohibitions of the Heavenly Religion—*i. e.*, The Behai Faith. Abbas, however, prefers to call himself simply Abdul-Beha—*i. e.*, the servant of Beha. When, in 1900, the envoy from Akka sought to procure the submission of Dr. Kheiralla, who for many years had been the leading promoter of Behaism in America, Dr. Kheiralla was ordered to assent to a certain confession if he would be taken back into the Behai church. In brief, it was this:

"There is no God but Beha; and Kitab-i-Akdas is a book revealed by God: Abbas is my Lord and Master. He who turneth away from him hath turned away from God; and I beseech God not to associate us with him either in this world or the next."

What are the chief doctrines of Behaism? First, that of the Divine Unity, the Self-Existent One; from him both the worlds and humanity emanate. A favorite name by which the Behais call themselves is "The Unitarians." As men cannot know the Eternal Invisible Essence, there occur from time to time manifestations or mirrors of the Primal Will. All the great prophets and sages and their revelations were words of God. Abraham, Moses, Jesus, and Muhammad were each successively more full of grace and truth than his predecessor. But each was an incomplete Manifestation. Beha fulfilled them with a higher and fuller Revelation of the Divine Unity not to be improved upon for thousands of years.

In Beha's own religious writings he speaks of himself in the most exalted terms. Beha entitles himself now as "The existent Root of things"—"The Lord of the Beginning and the End." Now as "The Beloved One who quickened the World and the Nations by the Waves of Revelation"; "The Divine Father whereof Israel gave you tidings and the Comforter whom the Spirit promised should come after him"; "Whosoever faces unto him hath faced unto God." "All preceding manifestations were ended in

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

this manifestation "—*i. e.*, Beha's: "This is a Divine Manifestation the like unto which shall manifest himself but once in five hundred thousand years."

Closely connected with the doctrine of Divine Manifestation is the doctrine of "The Return." The common people understand it as a doctrine of reincarnation of the soul in a second earthly life. But the Behai scholars and teachers say that this is an error.

The more subtle thinkers refine it into a mere identity in the archetypal idea of God or the Divine purpose. John the Baptist played the same rôle in the Divine purpose and thought as Elijah, and the Bab played the same rôle as Elijah.

As to the survival of the spirit Beha seems to have believed in a universal resurrection; but Abbas, according to the testimony brought back from Akka by Myron H. Phelps, teaches that for the great masses of humanity there is no hereafter: human consciousness does not survive the dissolution of the body. But where the mind is so developed that the Divine soul ray can form a complete union with it, then, that soul becomes a part of the Eternal Essence, man and God in one.

As to the Atonement, Abbas teaches that there is no Vicarious Atonement as held and taught by Christian theologians and churches. "Christ offered Himself as an *example.*"

As to the relation of the other faiths to Behaism, it is claimed that all other manifestations culminate in this Greatest Manifestation of Beha as the Glory of God, and "all preceding lights are merged in this horizon in which the sun of might and Glory hath dawned."

Why should one accept Behaism? Chief among the reasons that the Behais give is that it is more universal and full of divine truth and power than either Christianity or Muhammadanism. It is the promised light that should fulfil them. The popular proofs given for this are Apocalyptic—*i. e.*, drawn from the fulfilment of the prophecies in the Bible and the Quran by Beha, Abbas, and the Bab. Behaism claims to be a cosmopolitan faith in which all others shall be absorbed. It varies its proofs, therefore, with the nations to whom it presents itself. To the Jews it claims to fulfil the prophecies in the Old Testament and the Talmud; to the Christians it claims to accomplish the expecta-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tions of a Second Advent and realize the visions of the Apocalypse; to the Muhammadans the Bab is declared to be the Imam-Mahdi and Beha fulfils the longing of the faithful throughout Islam. The Behais constantly resort, therefore, to allegorical interpretation. All the ancient revelations are interpreted as pointing to the Persian masters. They quote with approbation the saying of one of the Imams: "We speak a word and we mean seventy meanings from it." In another place seven hundred meanings are affirmed.

Accordingly, the Behaists go through the Bible and the Quran and the Talmud, transforming days into years and names into numbers and numbers into types and symbols; and if they cannot succeed in hitting some date or other in the Bab's career or Beha's life or Abbas Effendi's existence that shows them to fulfil precisely the prophetic signs in one of the three great religions and disclose thus some mystical coincidence and deep celestial import, it is, indeed, lamentable. To find cogency in such proofs you must accept the equal inspiration of Bible, Quran, and Talmud, and be willing to interpret them neither literally nor critically nor historically, but allegorically.

Besides these popular proofs the Behai scholars appeal to the inspired writings of Beha, so manifold, excellent, and spontaneously produced; to the rapid diffusion of their religion, obtaining converts in so many different faiths and races; to the self-sacrificing devotion and fidelity of the Behais and to the fact that none of the religious Founders before Beha even claimed to be the Supreme Manifestation of the Self-Existent God. The Behais also adduce the practical good results of their faith in elevating the morals and purifying the character of their own disciples and also that of their neighbors. They declare that wherever it spreads it works wonders in assuaging religious feuds and racial and personal animosities, inspires ardent spiritual enthusiasm, and promotes knowledge, industry, and fraternity. As a general thing, I believe this is true. But Behaism does not have a monopoly to-day of such elevating influence.

Now as to laws and morals, what did Beha inculcate? In the main, he confirmed the precepts given by the Bab in the Beyan, but with many changes. The authoritative Book of Laws for Behais is the Kitab-i-Akdas, written by Beha himself. By his command it was lithographed in Bombay;

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

copies are in European libraries and translations of its substance have been published by European scholars.

In prayer the Behai believer is ordered to prostrate himself *nine* times daily with face turned toward the sacred city where Beha lived—*i. e.,* Akka (American believers, however, do not prostrate themselves, but only kneel). There is no congregational prayer. There are nineteen months of nineteen days each and five extra days kept as a holy festival. The last nineteen days before this festival are days of fasting which last from sunset to sunset. But American Behais have not yet attained to this height of self-restraint over their Occidental appetites. All self-mortifications, except the nineteen days' fast, are forbidden. Monkhood, beggary, and Sufiism are strongly prohibited.

A man caught a third time thieving is to be branded on the forehead. A husband cannot divorce a wife at once (as Muhammadan law allows), but must wait for a year for the chance of reconciliation. A second wife, while the first lives, is permitted, but not encouraged. Beha himself had two wives. All the wealthy must pay the head of the church nineteen per cent. of their income. Wine, opium, and praying in the streets and the carrying of arms except in time of war are prohibited, as also is slavery.

Criticisms and over-subtle explanations of the sacred code are banned, and any one who claims to have a new Mission or Divine Manifestation before the accomplishment of a thousand years is declared to be "a lying impostor."

The chief reforms of Beha were codified by him under fifteen heads called Good Tidings, which he promulgated in February, 1891. The first seven and the most important ones are in substance as follows:

1. Abolition of religious warfare. (No propagation of the faith by the sword.)

2. Permission of all sects and peoples to unite in friendly intercourse.

3. Permission to study foreign languages (which the Bab had prohibited), coupled with a recommendation that one language and one writing should be selected as a medium of international communication.

4. All the followers of El-Hak—*i. e.,* Beha—are bound loyally to serve and support any king who extends his protection to their faith.

5. All Beha's followers, in whatever land they dwell, must

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cheerfully and ungrudgingly submit to the laws and conform to the customs of that country.

6. Promise of the "Most Great Peace"—*i. e.*, that all nations shall become one in faith and harmony, and wars cease.

7. All are permitted (subject to the dictates of decency and good taste) to follow their own inclinations as to dress and the wearing of the hair.

As to the future of this religion, it is difficult to say. The supersedure of the Bab and Babiism by Beha and his reformed system, and especially the ambition of Abbas to seek his converts rather from the Christian world than from the Moslem, introduce very uncertain elements. The dissensions that have arisen obstruct the growth of the religion. The personality of neither Beha nor Abbas seems so well adapted to quicken religious enthusiasm or bind men in personal loyalty as that of the Bab did.

For any man to subordinate Jesus Christ in the reverence and affections of the world to any modern man who is to be regarded as a higher manifestation of the Divine is something that grows every day increasingly difficult. The reporters and the biographers are too numerous and too inquisitive to allow that idealistic magnifying and embellishment, which transforms a mere man into a divinity, to work sufficiently undisturbed nowadays. Moreover, that which should be the seal of a prophetic mission and divine revealer and the guarantee of the prophet's sincerity—an heroic death—becomes daily more difficult of attainment. It is by no means easy for the most ambitious leader to get himself crucified, or even shot, nowadays. The Bab had the rare good fortune to have not only an obscure youth and an unquestioned simplicity and devotion, but also a series of romantic adventures and a martyr death, and his life was crowned at its close by a most dramatic incident which came near contributing to history one of the most astounding and best-accredited miracles in the annals of religion.

Beha lacked noticeably all those important elements of life and character requisite for the man who would center about himself, as a Divine Being, the veneration of any large portion of the human race. It was, therefore, a strategic error of the first magnitude when the Bab was subordinated as the Supreme Manifestation in this faith to the far less inspiring personality and much more vulnerable character

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of Beha'u'llah. It is easy to see many things that naturally would lead a progressive Moslem to abandon Muhammad and the Quran for the Bab and the Beyan. But why should any Christian renounce the gospels and Jesus Christ for Beha and the turgid rhetoric of the Surat-ul-Heykel?

However, in expediency and administrative efficiency, for the time being, it was advantageous for the Babis to be turned by Beha's authority from their irreconcilable attitude against the State. They were led to abandon the open conflict with the Persian Government. It is pretty sure that the religion has grown faster thereby.

But is it not possible that the glowing faith which, in the devoted lives of the early Babis, courageously confronted the most frightful tortures and filled princes and prime ministers with dread of dire convulsions may, like the flame of Anabaptist zeal in Germany, cool down to tepid respectability, accommodate itself to the world, and simply add one more to the many obscure sects of the Orient?

On the other hand, we must remember the weakness of the Persian power and the activity of these dreamers of a new kingdom of heaven on earth.

The unhesitating faith, the heroic martyrdoms, and burning enthusiasm of the Babis were shared by all classes and common to young and old. Their fearless devotion inspired respect in the indifferent and struck terror even among their persecutors. If the Behais of to-day can maintain this fervid zeal and combine with it a practical prudence and wisdom that the Bab knew not, they may go far. It is possible even that some day there may be a manifestation and revolution, both religious and political, in that ancient land of Persia which will work as great a change as Muhammad in the seventh century wrought in Arabia and Syria.

But for Europe and America, it is difficult to see how the Behais can look forward to any great future. Surely they cannot expect to subordinate Christianity to Behaism as that higher faith in which the imperfect truth and grace of the Gospel is to be fulfilled. In European and American civilization, if religion survive at all, it will continue to reign under that sign of the cross above which Constantine read the inspiring motto, "In this symbol conquer."

James T. Bixby.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE PHILOSOPHY OF EDUCATION*

BY JOHN GRIER HIBBEN

In entering formally upon the duties of the high office of president of Princeton University, I wish to present in my inaugural address the essential principles of our philosophy of education. We believe that the chief end of an education is the making of a man. It is the process of developing a power within which enables the human being to dominate the instincts and habits of his animal nature, assert himself as a free personality, and direct his life according to the light of reason. While he is a part of the natural world, man belongs also to the world of mind and of spirit. The particular function of education is to give him the power of freedom and to make him sensible of the duties and worthy the privileges of a *person* in the midst of a universe of things.

Personality, however, is not mechanically formed from without, but must be evoked from within. The appeal of the teacher, therefore, is constantly directed to the inner spirit of the student, that spirit of life which informs the man and puts him into possession of his powers. The forces which find play in the activities of the mind are like the architectonic principle which is at work in the inner nature of a plant, fashioning it into the form of grace and beauty. Thus, with the emancipation of a free spirit at the sources of his being, the man within begins to develop both in power and in promise.

It is of the very nature of education, however, that it does not result in a complete and finished product, but rather in a progressive process. There is nothing final about it. Its achievements always mark new beginnings. It is the power of an endless life. To say that a man is educated signifies that he has finished merely the preliminary

* Inaugural address delivered at Princeton University, May 11, 1912.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

stages of a continuous and progressive development. Education, therefore, must always be defined in terms of life, of growth, of progress. Its peculiar function is the conservation of those great human forces which make for the advancement of knowledge and the civilization of the world. We hear much to-day of the conservation of our national resources, our forests, the treasures of our mines, and the vast material wealth of our land. But while we are emphasizing the necessity of a national economy we should not overlook the fact that the task of conserving and of developing the resources of the intellectual, moral, and spiritual power in our nation is the one supreme task. To conserve these powers, to cause them to develop and to prevail, to deliver free spirits from the bondage of ignorance and of material impulse, from the bondage of authority, of tradition, of public opinion, of passing fashion and of prejudice, and to direct these liberated human forces to the highest ends, that is the art of education.

There is a common phrase, "to *receive* an education," against which I would most emphatically protest. No one receives an education any more than he receives health or strength or life. It is the fruit of a firm and intelligent will. It is gained only by active effort, continuous and determined. An education is won by work; and the labors to be undertaken and the end to be attained may all be summed up in the command, *Be a person.* This is a command which is not merely the word of the teacher, but is essentially an inner compulsion possessing the solemn authority of self-legislation. It is the determination to be something more than a creature of circumstance; it is the purpose to realize in the full measure of one's possibilities the power and the dignity of humanity. While plant and animal develop according to the power which they may possess of adapting themselves to their environment, it is the distinctive characteristic of man that he progresses through his ability to adapt his environment to himself, and thus he determines the world in which he lives.

As freedom is the distinctive mark of a vigorous personality, all the processes of education must be directed to secure this essential end. Therefore, the ideal university education may be described as consisting of two phases—a phase in which every effort is directed to the attainment of freedom, and, secondly, a progressive phase of develop-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ment in which the freedom gained in the earlier stages finds for itself varied pursuits and pleasures in the fields of knowledge.

Hence it would seem essential that in the early years of one's university experience those studies should be pursued which are peculiarly conducive to the discipline and training of the mind, and eventually to the evolution of a self-determining and self-realizing will. They deserve the name of liberal studies so far as they may tend to free the mind from the natural and artificial obstacles to its progressive development.

One who is to maintain the health and growth of his intellectual life must come surely at some later period in his development to delight in the tasks of the intellect. To rejoice in the labors of the mind is not a prevailing characteristic of the natural man. As Aristotle has put it, "All men naturally desire knowledge, but not all men desire the labor of learning." It often happens, however, in intellectual discipline, as in the development of moral virility, that a course of action which is done for a time under the stress of a sense of obligation and as a grievous duty becomes after a time a pleasure and a joy. Just as it is possible to grow into an enthusiasm for that which is right and honorable and of good report, so also it is possible by the discipline of one's intellectual powers to develop an enthusiasm for the activities and pursuits of the mind.

The practical problem, therefore, for the teacher, and particularly for a faculty of teachers, is to choose that body of studies which will best produce a spirit of devotion to the cause of knowledge and of joy in its service. Any satisfactory solution of this problem must rest upon the basal principle that true intellectual freedom is gained only through discipline. If there is to be intellectual power in the world it must be the power of a free spirit; and the power of a free spirit in turn can arise only out of a spirit of docility. To this doctrine, however, there are many who would enter a most emphatic dissent. They very stoutly insist that there should be no body of required studies whatsoever in a university, but that each student should follow his own free choice in selecting the particular subjects he may be pleased to pursue and that such initial exercise of freedom is itself the best training for the wise uses of freedom in general. It is a very serious question

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

indeed, whether the freedom of an ignorant and undisciplined mind may not come to defeat its own ends and purposes.

In Princeton we have very positive convictions on this point. We believe that the teaching body of a university should select a consistent group of required studies for the express purpose of developing in the student to the highest degree of efficiency the free powers of his intellectual life. We believe that it is absolutely necessary to have a certain schooling in preparation for the responsibilities of freedom; and that the hit-and-miss choice of an immature mind in new and strange surroundings, the blind groping for truth by the process of trial and error, form a poor propædeutic to the serious tasks of free investigation, of original thought, and of practical efficiency. We believe, moreover, that the best preparation for the freedom of the life of reason is that group of studies whose very nature tends to the training of the powers of the mind, developing in a man both capability and resource, and at the same time giving him a knowledge of himself and of the world in which he lives.

Such studies are humanistic so far as they give a man a knowledge of the human setting of his life and create within his being a universal and sympathetic interest in humanity. They put him in possession of the race experience so that in his own mind he may hold the treasures of the world. Therefore, he must be so led in the way of knowledge that he will come to know something of the human world in which he lives, something also of the world of the past whose achievements are his heritage, something of the form and spirit of its classical languages and literature, something of its history, customs, manners, morals, and institutions—in a word, he must know the thought of the world which possesses universal meaning and universal significance. There are, indeed, certain fundamental ideas which we may securely reckon with as constant factors in the equation of life. I do not for a moment believe that the whole world of knowledge is composed of shifting and variable elements, so that we are constrained to acknowledge that whatever is true to-day may be false to-morrow. On the contrary, I would urge with all the emphasis of my deepest conviction that there is a body of universal truths, independent of age and of race, which vitally concern the ultimate values of life and which determine the possibilities

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of human development. Such truths the scholar must command if he in any sense is to command the world in which he lives.

Not only the human world, but also the world of nature, must be a part of this general body of knowledge. In these first stages of education the study of science should form a very central and essential part of this prescribed course of study. Pure science is a liberal study; it belongs truly to the humanities, for it not merely gives knowledge of facts; it does more: it is a training in habits of precision, in accuracy of observation, in closely articulated modes of reasoning, in devices of experimentation, and in an appreciation of the valid grounds of proof and the logical basis of correct generalization. A study of scientific method, and of the history of scientific attainment is in itself a course in inductive logic which tends not merely to fill the mind with items of information, but to expand it as well by an increased demand upon its powers of judgment and of inference. Princeton has been at times misunderstood as regards her attitude to science, and upon this occasion particularly I wish to state distinctly and emphatically and in words which give no uncertain sound that we regard the study of science as essential to a liberal education. So firmly grounded is this conviction that we require every candidate for the Bachelor's degree to pursue some one course at least in science. Princeton, which has the distinction of being the first college in America to introduce the teaching of chemistry in its curriculum; Princeton, which has been the home of Henry, of Guyot, and of Young, hardly needs to defend her old-time and continued interest in scientific discovery and scientific attainment.

Within this same group of studies also there should be some provision for a training in the accurate and facile mode of giving expression to knowledge. The ability to put thought into appropriate and adequate form essentially characterizes a free spirit in the world of mind. To see, to think, to feel, and to remain dumb withal—is any bondage more intolerable? Certainly the educated man should be able to understand his own language with some appreciation of its power and beauty, be able also to speak it as to the manor born and not as a barbarian, and to express himself by the written word in such a manner as to reveal and not to obscure his thought and feeling. He alone can give

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

life to knowledge who has acquired the art of communicating it to others.

At this early stage there should be also some instruction in the beginnings of logic and psychology, at least to the extent of leading the student to understand the workings of his own mind and the laws which govern the processes of reason. In such a course there must emerge some comprehension of the philosophical methods employed in various fields of investigation, of the relation of universal laws to facts, and of the nature of those central correlating and constructive ideas which in every sphere of thought and in every complex situation give a key to the solution of difficult and perplexing problems. It is no little gain in the uses of knowledge to appreciate the significance of universal concepts and to grasp the import of that great logical idea that there may be a unity in variety and an identity in difference. In my own experience in the teaching of philosophy I have come to the firm conviction that it is of incalculable advantage to the ordinary student to know something of the nature and the range of the main philosophical problems, for they are indeed the problems of life which will inevitably confront him in his own thinking. If in these preliminary discussions at the threshold of philosophy the student can begin to develop for himself some interpretation of life as a whole he has gained immeasurably in the possession of ideas which will tend to unify his thought and ground his conviction through all the wide extent of his experience.

Such is a brief description of the body of studies which should engage the first years of a student in his university career. At a time when he himself is learning to put his own mind in order he is unconsciously reinforced in his efforts if he finds himself daily engaged with a consistent group of studies which themselves form a system. A systematic mind does not develop naturally out of a miscellany of intellectual interests and activities. The idea of system and of systematic organization and of the logical correlation of essential parts within a consistent and comprehensive whole should characterize any body of required studies which is capable of justifying itself. Familiarity with a logical group of studies is itself an unconscious schooling in logic.

After this early period of required studies, the liberty which is born of discipline can be wisely encouraged to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

manifest itself in the free choices of study for the remaining years of the university course. It is in accordance with the Princeton programme that this freedom of choice is granted to every student at the beginning of the second half of his undergraduate course—at the opening of his Junior year; only the choice is not allowed to lose itself in a maze of unrelated subjects. Here again we believe that there rests upon the teaching body a peculiar obligation to prevent an unintelligent and indiscriminate choice of studies which will inevitably result in a corresponding dissipation of energy. No compulsion is laid upon the student in the upper years of his college course to enter any particular field of study or to engage in any particular pursuit, but when according to his own free will he decides upon the definite line of special work he wishes to undertake we believe that he should give himself to some systematic effort within a group of cognate subjects. We require him, therefore, to give a substantial part of his time to the courses of the particular department which he selects. Two courses, however, of the five required in each of the upper years may be chosen in any other fields particularly appealing to his interests. Freedom is thus secured without the danger of a loss of power in fruitless and confused activities.

While the student's work is centered in the region of his special interests, it must be taken up in a broad-minded spirit which transcends the utilitarian demands of any particular profession or technical pursuit. The university is not specifically designed for the purpose of fitting a man directly for the daily duties of his future work in life. It should not attempt to develop a particular talent for a particular task, but the whole man. No faculty of the mind can be satisfactorily trained in isolation. There must be a symmetrical growth of all faculties. The high potential of stored energy, moreover, acquired in the process of a fully rounded development of all a man's powers lends an increased momentum and driving force to the particular activities of his specialty and thus allows many lines of capability to meet in one point of practical efficiency. Methods of instruction should not narrow down to an anticipation of the customary procedure of the office and counting-room. The undergraduate education should not attempt to train specialists nor to drill the students in any definite routine or rules of practice. It is not rules of practice, but the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

fundamental principles and governing laws of a subject which are of supreme value to one who would win his way to the heart of knowledge. Fit a man for the day's work, but at the same time equip him to meet the crisis and the emergency which the day's work will inevitably bring forth. He who has laid a broad and secure foundation will have no difficulty in erecting the superstructure. Whatever he builds, he will be able to build himself into the work of his hand and brain. Make a man and he will find his work.

At this stage of the developing mind every effort should be put forth to secure originality of thought. By originality of thought I do not mean an original contribution to the world of knowledge necessarily, but an individual appropriation of the truth which by such a process becomes peculiarly one's own—the independent ability to think oneself *into* and *through* a subject, to be the master of one's knowledge and not its slave, and to acquire a critical sense of appreciation that will nicely discriminate, in the face of the crucial situations and the significant problems of life, between the things essential and the things unessential, between that which has value and that which has no value. We should not require of our students mere acquisition, but a high order of reflective thinking which manifests itself in methodical habits of clear and efficient thinking, in breadth of vision, in an intellectual curiosity, in a tolerant spirit and an open mind. Let us not standardize either the teacher or the student, but allow the full play of fresh original impulse.

Among all of the forces which tend to develop the strength of personality one of the most efficient in our experience at Princeton has been the preceptorial method of instruction. This rests upon the principle that nothing develops personality so fully and so satisfactorily as personality itself. To bring the inquiring mind into daily contact with the knowledge, the art, and the enthusiasm of one who is skilled in his own special field of attainment—this is the supreme end of education. The most satisfactory results are gained when instruction becomes individual. It is only by individual care and guidance that the man of one talent can be developed as well as the man of ten talents. The university has also a responsibility in ministering to the needs of the average man and enabling him to raise his factor of efficiency to its highest power. To discover native ability, to guide it into proper channels, to quicken ambition,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to fire the imagination, to watch and attend at the birth of a soul—that is the highest privilege and most solemn function of the teacher.

The results which by the four years of training we hope and expect to produce may be characterized in a single sentence: It is a transformation of the school-boy into a man of the world—a man who can move freely and familiarly in the midst of the world's varied activities, who speaks its language, who is conversant with its manners, and who can interpret its thought. Do not misunderstand this meaning, however; it must be the world conceived in no narrow and limited sense of the term. The true man of the world is not confined to the knowledge merely of his own day and generation. He must know the world of the past as well as the world of the present. For if he knows the past he is more capable of serving the present. He must be free from provincialism not only as regards space, but also as regards time. His knowledge also should not be restricted to any particular class of pursuits or of interests, but should comprehend a cross section of all social strata and embrace in intelligent and sympathetic regard the man whose life is a fight for bare existence as well as the one whom he may seek as a companion and friend. The more profound and widely extended his knowledge of the world the more powerfully will he dominate it. Let the college man be a man of the world, but let his world be the world of all time, of all lands, and of all sorts and conditions of men.

After the four years of the strictly college course have been completed there should be satisfactory facilities offered in a university for the varied pursuits of advanced students, where all of the powers broadly and profoundly developing during the preparatory years may be concentrated upon some subject which is to become the absorbing work of life. This is the region where many lines of effort converge in one focal point of heat and light; where special scholars may be trained; where the spirit of productive labor may be fostered; where they who learn may become in turn teachers and masters in the school of thought; where the once faltering mind may finally speak in tones of authority in the great world of knowledge. The buildings of our new Graduate College, now in process of construction, for a home where our special scholars, through daily intercourse one with another, may broaden their friendships and interests

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and at the same time find themselves stimulated in their zeal for the particular subjects which they are pursuing. There the communal life of those who have consecrated themselves to the sovereign decrees of truth should illustrate the devotion, the self-sacrifice, the austerity, and the enthusiasm of scholarship.

We hear much to-day of vocational studies. Princeton has ever recognized the value of vocational study, but we would reserve the privilege of interpreting the word vocational in its highest and most significant sense. We would give no meager nor secondary significance to this word. The truly vocational study, it would seem, is that which fits one to respond intelligently and with free conviction to the vocation of man—that high calling which is the summons to no particular pursuit nor profession, but which is a world-wide and common call to every man to take his place, to do his work, and to play his part in the community of his fellows. Whatever may be our special field of work, as men we are to live our lives within the great social organism of humanity. As Kant has splendidly put it, "Man's greatest concern is to know how he shall properly fill his place in the universe and correctly understand what he must be in order to be a man." The years of intellectual discipline should create in every one who is a sincere seeker after the truth a profound sense of human obligation, of an obligation which is the natural complement of the privileges which he has enjoyed. While our teaching must develop power, it must also develop a sense of responsibility for the use of that power; that sense of responsibility which makes the scholar peculiarly responsive to the claims of his less highly favored fellows. If there is an especially favored class in the world, it is the group of men who have profited by the privileges of an education. It is their duty to prove themselves worthy of recognition as an aristocracy—as an aristocracy, however, in the original meaning of that word. And their rule and influence in the community in which they live will show itself to be the best so far as it is determined by a wise purpose to devote the power of knowledge to the betterment of human conditions and to the satisfaction of human needs. It is in no sense a survival of the *fittest* if he who survives is content to survive alone. Our universities must teach to their students in season and out of season this lesson of life: With all their getting let them get under-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

standing — that understanding of their station and their duties which will reveal to them this supreme law of privilege, that he who commands the sources of light must become a bearer of light to others. The perplexing political questions of the day arise largely out of strained and perverted social relations of man to man. If our social relations are to be satisfactorily adjusted, the privileged classes must give to their less favorably conditioned fellows some wise thought, some measure of sacrifice, some active sympathy and consideration, and thereby make success tributary to service. They who are coming more and more to be regarded as the natural leaders in this cause of humanity and they who are under compulsion to lead by example as well as by precept and suggestion are that very class of men who have come into possession of the highest of all privileges— the trained mind and the human heart.

The first President of our country and the first American received in Nassau Hall the grateful acknowledgments by Continental Congress for his service in establishing the freedom and independence of the United States. For a part of the year 1783, from June to November, Nassau Hall was the Capitol of the young Republic, and here Adams, Jefferson, Madison, and their distinguished colleagues sat in counsel. The love of country has been a central lesson in the teachings of our university. Naturally we cannot expect our students generally to attain to the high offices of public trust in our country, but we do expect every man who bears the Princeton mark and who is true to the Princeton traditions to serve his day and generation with fidelity and to bear upon his soul the burden of humanity.

This institution was not founded in the spirit of civil liberty alone, but in the spirit of religious liberty as well; in that Christian faith and hope which is our most treasured tradition. Our fathers learned the lesson of the Great Teacher that the law of life is a law of liberty—a liberty which finds expression, however, in a law of service and a law of sacrifice. Our hope and our prayer is that their sons who bear their names and who are of their breed and blood may keep faith with the past while moving forward to possess the new lands of promise and of plenty.

JOHN GRIER HIBBEN.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

NEW BOOKS REVIEWED

A New Conscience and an Ancient Evil. By Jane Addams. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1912.

Whatever Jane Addams writes is of value because she is a woman of vast experience, logical mind, and restrained emotions. Her quarter of a century of work in Hull House has put her in a position to speak more authoritatively on the subject of the conditions, lives, temptations of the underworld than any one else in our country. The present volume upon social evil is timely as furnishing a corrective to the rather brutally careless tone upon this subject adopted by Mr. William H. Allen in his very popular recent volume, *Woman's Part in Government, Whether She Votes or Not.* In contradiction to Mr. Allen's suggestion that "girls are unsafe in direct proportion to the largeness not to the smallness of their salary," Miss Addams cites numerous cases—indeed, one would say two-thirds of those on record—where an evil life was the final desperate resort of a woman either starving herself or watching others starve. The attitude of careless indifference in Mr. Allen's book made it one of the most harmful and dangerous of publications unless some corrective could be supplied with it. Doubtless he intended merely to urge preventive rather than remedial measures to be applied to the distressing situation, but his zeal led to most dangerous expressions of opinion. Miss Addams, on the contrary, is never hysterical or over-emphatic. She compares the present social evil to the conditions brought about by slave-trading and slave labor in the past. "The economist who for years insisted that slave labor continually and arbitrarily limited the wages of free labor," she says, "was a forerunner of the economist of to-day who points out the economic basis of the social evil, the connection between low wages and despair, between over-fatigue and the demand for reckless pleasure."

This volume considers merely the sexual commerce existing in every large city, usually in a segregated district. All modifications of legal codes regarding marriage and divorce, moral judgments concerning the entire group of questions centering about illicit affection between men and women, are not touched upon. But as against Mr. Allen's contention that it is impossible for the average person to inform himself upon these vital subjects without becoming morbid and vitiated, Miss Addams says, "human progress is deeply indebted to a study of imperfections, and the counsels of despair, if not full of seasoned wisdom, are, at least, fertile in suggestion and a desperate spur to action."

Miss Addams commends the work Bernard Shaw and Brieux have done in England and France by placing the simple truth before the public so that it becomes conscious of its own hypocrisy in regard to it,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and realizes that a veritable horror, simply because it was covered over and hidden, had come to seem inevitable and normal. Such writing as these men have done, says Jane Addams, "is the roll of the drum which announces the approach of the troops."

Miss Addams reviews in this book the recent legal enactments that concern the social evil; the amelioration of economic conditions (a subject with which Mr. Allen's book, *Woman's Part in Government*, is exclusively concerned); Moral Education and Legal Protection of Children; Philanthrophic Rescue and Prevention; and Increased Social Control. Her theories are substantiated by a large number of cases with which Miss Addams has come in personal contact, none more pathetic than that in which she tells how she visited a home for semi-delinquent girls against each of whom stood a grave charge involving the loss of chastity. Upon each of the little white beds or on the stiff chairs standing by was a doll belonging to the young delinquent. "I had come to the house prepared to lecture to its inmates," writes Miss Addams; "I remained to dress dolls with a handful of little girls who eagerly asked questions about the dolls I had once possessed."

Miss Addams's book is a book for every woman in the country to read and own and keep on hand to refer to. It is the outcome of a great brain and a greater heart and a life of more than self-abnegation—a life of self-dedication. If, as Miss Addams hopes, America bears a valiant part in the international crusade of the compassionate, enlisting under its banner not only those sensitive to the wrongs of others, but those conscious of the destruction of the race itself, who form the standing army of humanity's self-pity, it will owe the largest single debt of gratitude to Miss Addams herself, who has taught in life and in words what her great master Tolstoy lived to teach, namely, that "though we constantly think that there are circumstances in which a human being can be treated without affection, there are no such circumstances."

LAUGHTER: An Essay on the Meaning of the Comic. By HENRI BERGSON. Authorized translation by Cloudesley Brereton and Fred. Rothwell. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1911.

The English authoritative work upon the psychology of the comic is still George Meredith's famous essay *On the Comic*. Bergson's book is made up of three essays originally published in the *Revue de Paris*, and his treatment is quite simple and untechnical. The first essay treats of the general nature of the Comic; the second, of the Comic element in words and situations; and the third, of the Comic character.

The general and penetrative theory which Bergson tries to introduce is that the comic begins at the point where spirit ceases to enliven matter; at that point, namely, where matter acts mechanically and separately from the informing spirit. Involuntary action is one of the most usual excitants of laughter; wherever through absent-mindedness or lack of elasticity or physical obstinacy, as a result, in fact, of rigidity or momentum. The muscles continue to perform a movement when the circumstances call for readjustment. Again, along the same lines, a character is likely to be comic in proportion to its lack of self-knowledge. The comic person is comic just at the point where intelli-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

gence stops short and the character is unconscious of its own real traits. Harpagon was a miser, but unconscious of his miserliness. This is again a form of automatism not unlike the simple physical awkwardness which excites laughter.

Life and society requiring of each of us a constantly alert attention to the outlines of the immediate situation, together with an elasticity of mind and body to enable us to adapt ourselves to it, we become comic when we lack them slightly, and tragic when we lack them entirely.

Bergson points out first that laughter is and must always point to *absence of feeling,* since emotion is the arch-enemy of laughter. The comic, he says, cannot produce its effect unless it fall upon a soul thoroughly calm and unruffled. It is at this point that one might well introduce the question as to why it is that while Socrates could go to a comedy and laugh heartily at a caricature of himself, no stretch of imagination will allow one to think of Christ as laughing at any caricature of a human being. He had the nobility and divinity of human nature too deeply at heart.

Secondly, Bergson makes it a point that all laughter is always laughter of a group and implies some subtle freemasonry or complicity. A man, asked why he did not weep when a whole congregation were shedding tears, replied, "I don't belong to the parish." His theory of tears is even more applicable to laughter. We have to be in the secret to see the fun.

With Meredith he agrees that the truly comic can only begin when society and the individual, freed from the worry of self-preservation, begin to regard themselves as works of art. To produce a comic poet, then, a high degree of civilization is required and a certain equality between the sexes. A simple bourgeois circle rarely furnishes wit. It is likely to be as inwardly dull as outwardly correct, as Meredith points out.

In the second essay Bergson says that a comic meaning is invariably obtained when an absurd idea is fitted into a well-established phrase form. This is a mode of wit used very largely by some of our best-known humorous writers; take, for example, E. S. Martin's essay on Women, in which he gravely discusses "those influences which tend to make a man of her"; or again the effect the same writer gets when he says of the sea: "The sea, to be sure, can stand all climates, is left out in all weathers, endures all atmospheric fluctuations, all kinds of sunlight, short rays, and blistering heat, and still survives. Survives! Yes, but with what vicissitudes of temper and behavior!"

If the misapplication of the conventional phrase is the form of wit we find most used by Lowell, Warner, and E. S. Martin, the whole of English wit consists in understating, another form which Bergson mentions as being as effective as exaggeration, which is the stock-in-trade of Mark Twain. All these various forms Bergson fits into his theory that the very essence of the comic is an exaggeration of a certain natural rigidity in things. Light comedy, he says, holds the same relation to actual life that a jointed doll does to a man. The comic character must be, says Bergson, deep rooted so as to furnish inexhaustible matter to comedy; superficial, in order that it may remain within the scope of comedy; invisible to its owner, as the comic always partakes of the nature of the unconscious; careful of itself, so it may be displayed without scruple;

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

troublesome to others, so that it may be repressed without pity; inseparable from social life and yet insufferable to society. These essays furnish the most thoroughgoing analysis of the sources and effects of laughter we have yet had.

THE RELIGION OF SCIENCE. By JAMES W. LEE. New York: Fleming H. Revell Company, 1912.

None who follow the fluctuations of religious thought can have failed to note the reaction in the last quarter of a century from materialistic philosophy. Not only has there been a renascence of wonder, a great revival of confidence in the mystic realities of experience, but a continuous growth toward a newer interpretation of age-old dogma which should bring it in line with the facts of the spiritual life. Of this latter attitude, James W. Lee is an eloquent exponent.

The author points out that religion is the only subject concerning which every person exercises the privileges of private interpretation. If a bank clerk were suspected of entertaining opinions about the multiplication table not held by the directors, says the author, he would be asked to resign his position. In all matters of verifiable and tangible fact this is naturally so, and the author would seem somewhat to overlook the difficulties of making a science of the subtle and secret relations of the soul to its Creator. Religion, he concedes, is the only important reality left unsystematized by the scientific method. He is disturbed that though we receive our theories of the stars from astronomers, and of the elements from chemists, we accept or reject the conclusions of theologians according as they tally with our private experience. The author believes, however, that it is possible to build a theological system large and comprehensive enough to contain universally valid knowledge of the realities of religion, and that the time to do so is at hand. Theology, he believes, if constructed in accordance with the principles of the scientific method, will become a science for religion, in the same way that astronomy is a science for the stars. Perhaps a spiritual truth can never be quite so static as a physical one. The wind of the spirit bloweth where it listeth, and spiritual facts, being of the very essence of life, are a continuous growth. The realities of religion, it is true, can never be settled by vote, as Bertrand Russell says the pragmatists settle philosophical truths, but must always be judged by their fecundity. By their fruits ye shall know them, and nothing will ever convince men of spiritual truth but the fruits of the spirit. A transformed life is a reality, and whenever any religion can show that it has power to transform human nature into divine nature, self-preservation into love and self-sacrifice, it will prevail.

The author explains that what he means by a science of religion is such an intellectual construction as will enable us to store our conceptions of spiritual realities in a house equal in style to the other buildings in the city of universally valid knowledge. What he means by the religion of science is Christianity, because he finds it to be a perfect expression and complete realization of the idea which students of religion tell us is at the bottom of all religions.

The most valuable contribution in the volume is the author's final plea in the last chapter for a race with unified interests.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"Nothing less than commercial, intellectual, ethical, and spiritual unity is to be the final outcome of man's career on earth, for the simple reason that unity is the essential, fundamental fact at the bottom of life."

This idea is in direct line with the great mass of modern speculation; with that noble conjecture of the judicious Hooker that "God is not only one, but very oneness." Is not Browning saying the same thing when he writes:

> "When all mankind is alike perfected,
> Equal in full-blown powers—then, not till then,
> I say begins man's general infancy.
>
> . . . . . .
>
> Then shall his long triumphant march begin,
> Thence shall his being date."

Indeed, when all men bring forth the fruits of the spirit, which are love and self-sacrifice, we shall have a religion of science.

ST. FRANCIS OF ASSISI. By JOHANNES JORGENSEN. New York: Longmans, Green & Co., 1912.

There are many lives of St. Francis, but nothing of modern date can quite bring to mind the wondrous personality of the great saint as do the old books—the *Life,* by St. Bonaventura, the *Legend of the Three Companions,* the two lives by Thomas of Celano, the *Little Flowers of St. Francis, The Mirror of Perfection,* and the *Sacrum Commercium.* All these books, except Thomas of Celano, come now in the handy little Temple edition. For English readers the definitive and final biography must still be that of Sabatier. Practically all the necessary sources were reached by him, and whatever details needed revising could easily have been done in foot-notes. Sabatier had every equipment for his task: a liberal mind, temperamental understanding, leisure, and supreme devotion. He gave thirteen years to his work, and when done it was the final authority on the subject.

As we open Jörgensen's book our taste is at once offended by the silly and sentimental picture of St. Francis by Spagnoletto, used as frontispiece. It is as unrepresentative a portrait as could have been chosen. There is a well-established tradition of St. Francis's features; a tradition followed by Giotto, Lippo Lippi, Fra Angelico, and Gozzoli. One of the most beautiful and perfect portraits of the saint is Lippo Lippi's, in the National Gallery picture entitled "St. John the Baptist and Six Saints." For some reason this portrait is never reproduced in Franciscan literature.

The disquieting error of taste that dictated the frontispiece is offensive also in the style of the book, with its pseudo-realistic details. On the first page one is assured that St. Francis, during his convalescence, "lay on one side of the wide bed while the other was made up for him." Evidently the author's experience of modern hospitals was greater than his medieval learning. He also supplies us with long imaginary conversations between Francis and his mother. The whole attempt to force vividness by inaccuracy is painful and annoying. The scholastic notes at the back of the book, while valuable to a Franciscan student, are cumbersome in form and awkward in setting.

The English into which the volume is translated is unscholarly; the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tense-sequence is badly handled. The volume bears the *Nihil Obstat* of the Catholic censor and the signature of Cardinal Farley. But without this it would still quite evidently be an attempt to produce a Catholic, popular *Life* which might displace Sabatier's. This one will never displace it for those who care to know the real St. Francis.

ROMANCE AND REALITY. By HOLBROOK JACKSON. New York: Mitchell Kennerley, 1912.

If this volume of essays is not a very praiseworthy production, it is because the *genre* makes such great demands. The essay is to prose what the sonnet is to poetry. It must not only be "of its own arduous fullness reverent," but it must be masterly in form. Arnold's essays and Pater's still remain supreme achievements, and all our American essayists and most of the living English essayists have perfection still to seek.

The best of the essays contained in the volume are the literary introductions to Maeterlinck, Chesterton, Wells, and Robert Blatchford. In these the author achieves swift condensations of essential points and a power of quite vivid portraiture. He gives the essence of Maeterlinck, whose acute sense of the reality of the soul came to his contemporaries almost as a new revelation, when he says of him, "Everything for him has spiritual significance, yet never for a moment does he pretend to revealed or superhuman knowledge; he is untiring in his watchfulness, but brings no news of final certainty."

The portrait of Chesterton, who lends himself so easily both to heroic portraiture and caricature, strikes a happy medium and is done to the life.

The *Essays Utopian,* which open the book, are ephemeral and belong of their nature to periodical literature and not to a bound book. The section "Peter—Pantheism" just misses the charm which the truly child-like nature captures. Barrie or William Canton could have taken these subjects and touched them with magic, but here it is lacking, and the material is too slight to last.

It is again the wizard's touch which is lacking to bring the section boldly called after George Meredith's *Readings of Earth* up to the point where it might claim the attention of a serious reader. Either strong emotion in the face of nature or exceptional powers of observation are the *sine qua non* of the nature-essay. The book contains essays above the average of those furnished us by the periodicals, but as a book the volume would hardly have a right to permanent shelf-room in the library of a literature-lover.

HADJI MURAD. THE LIGHT THAT SHINES IN DARKNESS. By LEO TOLSTOY. Translated by Aylmer Maude. New York: Dodd, Mead & Co., 1912.

Rarely has a great master fallen into such incompetent and unsympathetic hands as Tolstoy. As if his other-worldliness were of itself not enough to make nine-tenths of the world misunderstand him, he must have all his manuscripts handled by one who never misses an occasion to belittle. Aylmer Maude is neither an understanding commentator nor a good translator. "The foot-notes," he writes in the introduction to *Hadji Murad,* "are not a part of the original work, but belong to the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

translation." The statement is unnecessary, as the foot-notes are mainly English equivalents of Russian words which the translator perversely retains in the text to disfigure the page and annoy the reader. Why such words as *kizyak, burka, aoul, naïb* should be retained when the English equivalents are at hand it is difficult to conceive. There are on the small, large-print pages sometimes as many as nine italicized Russian words, and then the work is called a translation! Whenever the conversation is in French, Aylmer Maude gives an English translation in the foot-notes. Any one who would, for the sake of getting at Tolstoy's thought, be willing to read the awkward, Russian-besprinkled English would be sure to know enough French to read these conversations.

The story of *Hadji Murad* was written by Tolstoy during his illness of 1901-02, and it is not one of his great stories. Done at a time when he was not at all well and unable to work on *What is Religion?*—a book that he really had at heart—the tale is bald and meager. Only one who made a special study of Tolstoy and wanted to know his mind in all its phases would find it readable. His point of view is there, his sincerity, his intensity, but very little of his literary art. The tale is really only a first draft or outline of a book.

In the introduction to *The Light that Shines in Darkness,* the biographer, a man who would have nothing to say and no power of saying it but for the great master upon whom he battens while he defames, again takes occasion to plead Countess Tolstoy's case. Hers is a case of simply being not large enough for her destiny. This is not a crime, and few women in the world would have been able to meet the situation. But if the persistent defamation of Tolstoy is continued with the Countess's consent and knowledge, the whole matter wears a different and a less pardonable aspect.

The play is an unfinished attempt to show once more the tortures a man must suffer who finds his life split in two by a double allegiance, a personal and a universal claim. The play is unfinished, and in the end Tolstoy sketches in two or three possible endings to the situation, none of them so dramatic and so tragic as the actual ending.

WHAT TOLSTOY TAUGHT. Edited by BOLTON HALL. New York: B. W. Huebsch, 1912.

The *raison d'être* of the present volume is the suggestion of the late Ernest Crosby to the author that people could not and would not read Tolstoy's religious books. Despite Tolstoy's wonderful power of handling material in his novels and romances, those religious utterances are full of wearisome repetition and incoherencies. The present author has therefore undertaken to make a coherent series of extracts from the volumes *What is Life? My Confession, My Religion,* and *What to Do.*

The book is divided into two parts; the first part, "On Life," containing such chapter-headings as The Separate Life, Delusions about Life, The True Law, Desire, Unity of Life, Pursuit of Happiness, etc. The second part, "On Action," deals with Church, School, Art, Women, etc. As a condensation of Tolstoy's religious life-doctrine, the book is excellent; clear, terse, to the point, and presented almost entirely in Tolstoy's own words by means of extracts from his works.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED